DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 456		HE 021 369

TITLE	Comments and Recommendations on "The Consortium of the California State University: A Report." A Response to Supplemental Language in the 1987 Budget Act Regarding the Closure of the Consortium. Report 87-45.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Dec 87
NOTE	165p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 Twelfth St., Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Consortia; Cooperative Programs; Dual Enrollment; *Educational Finance; *External Degree Programs; Financial Policy; *Financial Support; Full State Funding; Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; Program Evaluation; *Program Termination; Resource Allocation; School Funds; *State Aid; State Government; *State Universities; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*California State University; Funding Formulas

ABSTRACT

At the request of the state legislature, the California State Postsecondary Education Commission presents comments on "The Consortium," a 14-year-old external degree program which the California State University decided to disband. Commission comments on the university report include concerns over the funding mechanisms currently employed for consortium programs offered by the campuses (since the Commission recommended that all degree-granting programs be state-funded). The three main recommendations offered by the Commission are that (1) the Governor and legislature accept the State University's report, "The Consortium of the California State University" as adequately addressing the issues raised by the Supplemental Language to the Budget Act of 1987; (2) the California State University seek state support for any program that was once a part of the Consortium; and (3) if the cost of operating these programs is more than the amount generated by the state general fund revenue, the state university (with the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst) should develop suitable mechanisms to fund the difference. Appendices include related correspondence and "The Consortium of the California State University: A Report." The 13-page report with its appendixes comprise the major part of the document. Appendixes include a brief history of the Consortium and memoranda on the transfer of programs to individual campuses. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 293456

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON "THE CONSORTIUM OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY: A REPORT"

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
California
Postsecondary Education
Commission
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

HE 021 369

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Executive Summary

IN response to the California State University's decision to disband its 14-year-old external degree program called "The Consortium," the Legislature adopted Supplemental Language to the Budget Act of 1987 calling on the State University to report by October 15, 1987, to the Commission and the Legislature on its plan for assuring continued availability of the Consortium's offerings. The Legislature also directed the Commission to submit comments and recommendations about the State University's report to the Legislature by December 15, 1987.

On October 15, the State University transmitted the required report to the Commission, along with information requested by Commission staff. This document comments on those materials, which are attached as Appendices B and C. The Commission has concluded that the materials are responsive to the Legislature's concerns, and it therefore recommends that the Legislature accept the State University's report. It also offers two recommendations to the Governor, Legislature, and State University regarding future funding of external degree programs at the State University, which reaffirm current Commission policies:

1. The Commission recommends that the Governor and Legislature accept the State University's report, *The Consortium of the California State University*, as adequately addressing the issues raised by the Supplemental Report Language that called for "assurance that any program changes retain statewide availability of the program, accreditation, and the current emphasis on the non-traditional adult learners, off-campus sites, flexible scheduling, open entry/open exit curriculum and opportunities to test out of courses."
2. The Commission also recommends that the California State University seek State support for all programs that were formerly part of the Consortium and that the Governor and Legislature grant this support.
3. The Commission further recommends that in those instances where the cost of operating these programs exceeds the amount of State General Fund revenue generated by full-time equivalent student budgetary formulas plus regular student fees, the State University, in concert with the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst, develop appropriate mechanisms, such as enriched student/faculty ratios, to fund the marginal difference.

•

The Administration and Liaison Committee of the Commission adopted this report at its meeting on December 14, 1987, on behalf of the Commission. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Publications Office of the Commission at (916) 322-8031. Questions about the report may be directed to Murray J. Haberman of the Commission staff at (916) 322-8001.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON "THE CONSORTIUM OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY: A REPORT"

A Response to Supplemental Language in the 1987 Budget Act Regarding the Closure of the Consortium

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

COMMISSION REPORT 87-45
PUBLISHED DECEMBER 1987

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 87-45 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested

Contents

History of the Consortium 1

Scope of the State University's Report 2

Commission Comments on the Report 2

Recommendations 4

Reference 4

Appendices 5

A. Letter to Ralph D. Mills from Murray J. Haberman, September 23, 1987 5

B. Letter to Murray J. Haberman from Ralph D. Mills, October 15, 1987 7

C. Letter to William L. Pickens from W. Ann Reynolds, October 15, 1987, with Attachment, *The Consortium of the California State University: A Report* 13

Comments and Recommendations on "The Consortium of the California State University: A Report"

IN May 1973, the California State University created its Consortium, which was commonly known as "the 1,000 Mile Campus" in order to offer external degree, certificate, and credential programs for adults who found it difficult or impossible to enroll in regular on-campus programs. The Consortium's programs were primarily upper division or graduate level and were financed by student fees. Using the faculty resources of the 19 campuses of the State University and other experienced practitioners, these programs provided individualized instruction at more than 100 locations throughout the State.

This past June, primarily for financial reasons, the State University disbanded the Consortium. In response, the Legislature adopted Item 6610-001-001 of Supplemental Language to the Budget Act of 1987, which stated:

> *California State University* -- Consortium Program. The California State University (CSU) shall report, by October 15, 1987, to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC), and legislative fiscal committees regarding the statewide consortium program. The report shall include recommendations regarding (1) the appropriate level of student fees and the appropriate degree of state support and (2) assurance that any program changes retain the statewide availability of the program, accreditation, and the current emphasis on nontraditional adult learners, off-campus sites, flexible scheduling, open-entry/open-exit curriculum, and opportunities to test out courses. The CPEC shall review the report and submit comments and recommendations to the JLBC and the fiscal committees by December 15, 1987.

Pursuant to that language, Commission staff asked that the State University address, as part of its report, several Commission and legislative staff concerns (Appendix A). The State University responded with the materials that appear in Appendices B and C. In this report, the Commission presents a brief history of the Consortium and analyzes those materials. It then presents conclusions and recommendations based on its analysis.

History of the Consortium

Through its Consortium, the State University sought to meet the educational needs of students that could not be met effectively by its individual campuses through a statewide program, administered by its systemwide office, that utilized faculty and program resources throughout the State University system. The programs offered were self-supporting, with the direct cost of instruction covered by student fees.

The State University requested State funds to support the Consortium's administrative and program development costs and to provide fee-waivers to students unable to pay course fees. The State did not fully grant these funds, but the State University provided supplemental funding from its Continuing Education Revenue Fund and a variety of grants from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

In 1976, the Senior Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accredited the Consortium, which into the 1980s effectively operated as a twentieth campus of the State University. In 1982, the State University reorganized the Consortium in order to stabilize its operations, but by 1986, officials of the State University sensed that those efforts were not working. As the State University notes in Appendix A of its report, "It was becoming increasingly apparent that to maintain its fiscal viability, the Consortium would have to increase its fees to levels beyond the means of the students the program was intended to serve" (p. 2). Meanwhile, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges placed the Consortium on probation "out of concern for the instability of the Consortium in respect to its

7

mission, administration, and financial resources" (p. 2).

By Fall 1986, State University officials concluded that the Consortium was no longer a viable operation and would have to be closed. However, they acknowledged the system's obligation to serve students who were currently enrolled in Consortium programs, and they further recognized its responsibilities to continue meeting the needs of all nontraditional part-time students. It was also evident that the Statewide Nursing Program, which comprised about 80 percent of the Consortium's enrollment, was a highly successful system of education that should not be disbanded.

To protect the interests of current and future students, the Office of the Chancellor solicited the 19 campuses to take over the administration of the Consortium's programs and at the same time requested that the campuses maintain the nontraditional nature of these programs. To that end, all but one of the Consortium's programs were transferred to various campuses. Specific memoranda of understandings were developed between the Office of the Chancellor and the campuses to assure program viability. As a result of these actions, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges removed the Consortium from probation and extended its accreditation until January 1989, thereby assuring that students enrolled in those programs would continue to receive their degrees from an accredited institution. Then the Consortium, as a separate entity, was officially disbanded on June 30, 1987.

Scope of the State University's report

Pursuant to the Supplemental Language to the Budget Act of 1987 quoted above, Commission staff contacted State University and legislative staff to determine what concerns should be addressed in the State University's final report. As an outgrowth of these discussions, Commission staff suggested that the State University cover the following topics in its report:

- A comprehensive history of the Consortium, including a discussion of the reasons why the nontraditional format was created;
- A list of all programs offered by the Consortium, including information on each program's headcount enrollment, full-time-equivalent enrollment, student contact hours, number of applicants, number of graduates, size and scope of its faculty and administration, and its operating costs;
- The State University's plan for accommodating Consortium students, both those currently enrolled and those previously enrolled who may return at some future date;
- The terms and conditions for transferring Consortium programs from the Chancellor's Office to the campuses, including the criteria for transferring a specific program to a campus;
- The provisions for the administration of both past and current student records; and
- The provisions for continued accreditation of Consortium programs.

Furthermore, in direct response to legislative staff concerns, Commission staff requested that the State University respond in detail to these questions:

Accommodation: How will the State University assure that students currently enrolled in Consortium programs will be accommodated by the campuses in a manner consistent with the Consortium's original nontraditional intent?

Funding: How should reconstituted Consortium programs be funded? What justification is there for State funding, self-support funding, or a combination of both?

Access: Will the reconstituted Consortium programs continue to provide access for nontraditional students? What assurances can the State University make that campus-based programs will not restrict access?

This past October 15, the State University submitted its report to the Commission in which it sought to respond to those questions.

Commission comments on the report

The State University's report and its accompanying

8

correspondence that appear as Appendices B and C below adequately address the Commission's concerns outlined above. Furthermore, the report addresses legislative staff concerns regarding accommodation and access for students, in that the Office of the Chancellor has made a concerted effort to meet both the needs of students enrolled in the Consortium's programs and of those likely to enroll in such nontraditional efforts.

The Commission has several concerns, however, regarding the funding mechanisms to be employed for Consortium programs now offered by the campuses, in light of the Commission recommendation in its 1980 report *Degrees of Diversity* that all degree-granting programs be State funded and that

> the exact dollar amount of this support per full-time-equivalent student should be negotiated among the Governor, the Legislature, and the State University Trustees, but should be sufficient: (1) to insure that students in State-supported external degree programs will be charged fees comparable to those for on-campus students; and (2) to provide an adequate level of support services (p. 99).

Regarding this Commission recommendation, the State University has stated in correspondence accompanying its report on the Consortium that:

> All Consortium programs being offered by State University campuses will continue to be self-supporting during 1987-88, with one exception. Students previously enrolled in The Consortium's B.S. program in Health Care Administration have been admitted to state-support courses being offered by California State University, Long Beach.
>
> In some instances, campuses have requested that the adopted Consortium programs be funded by the State, beginning with fiscal year 1988-89. In other instances, campuses expect to continue operating former Consortium programs on a self support basis.
>
> At present, it is the State University's position that students participating in nontraditional programs receiving General Fund support should pay the same fees as students who attend regular, State-supported on-campus programs and that in connection with programs for which state funding is being requested during 1988-89, state support should be provided on the basis of established budgetary formulas.
>
> During 1987-88 and 1988-89, Chancellor's Office staff, in cooperation with the Dominquez Hills campus, will study fiscal and other policy issues relating to the effort to integrate the Consortium's nontraditional Statewide Nursing Programs into the General Fund program environment. On the basis of this experience, CSU may seek to effect such changes as may be necessary to enable nontraditional programs to operate effectively and efficiently within the General Fund.

In essence, the State University has recommended that "student fees for nontraditional programs be the same as fees charged students attending traditional, state-supported on-campus programs" (Appendix B, p. 5) -- but only for the Statewide Nursing Program component of the Consortium, and only after the issue is further studied, and only for those programs for which the campuses are seeking State funding. The Commission's policy has been that *all* degree-granting programs, such as those of a Consortium nature, should be State funded. Clearly, some campuses may opt for continuing the self-supporting nature of Consortium type programs, in that the costs for such programs, especially those with small enrollments and at a great distance from the parent campus, are often quite high.

The Commission believes that campuses conducting such external degree type programs should determine whether such programs are practical from both a cost and logistical standpoint. The Commission also believes that costs incurred by external degree program students should closely approximate those of the on-campus students.

The Commission therefore suggests that campuses must first determine if an external degree program's potential enrollment will assure its cost effectiveness. This determination should be based on the amount of State General Fund revenue generated by the program's full-time-equivalent enrollment, plus regular fees comparable to those paid by on-campus students. In fairness to off-campus students, student activity fees, such as student union dues, health fees, or fees for other activities that off-campus students would not utilize, should be subtracted from the regular on-campus student fees. Clearly, the Commission's position, as articulated in *Degrees of Diversity*, is that the State should bear the primary cost of instruction for off-campus external degree programs, such as those formerly offered through the Consortium and now offered through individual campuses In the Commission's opinion, the cost to the student under this scenario would be substantially less than the $138 per unit charge currently paid by Consortium students.

Recommendations

Based on the above conclusions, the Commission offers these three recommendations to the Governor, Legislature, and State University:

1. **The Commission recommends that the Governor and Legislature accept the State University's report, "The Consortium of the California State University" as adequately addressing the issues raised by the Supplemental Report Language that called for "assurance that any program changes retain statewide availability of the program, accreditation, and the current emphasis on the non-traditional adult learners, off-campus sites, flexible scheduling, open entry/open exit curriculum and opportunities to test out of courses."**

2. **The Commission also recommends that the California State University seek State support for all programs that were formerly part of the Consortium and that the Governor and Legislature grant this support.**

3. **The Commission further recommends that in those instances where the cost of operating these programs exceeds the amount of State General Fund revenue generated by full-time equivalent student budgetary formulas plus regular student fees, the State University, in concert with the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst, develop appropriate mechanisms, such as enriched student/faculty ratios, to fund the marginal difference.**

Reference

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Degrees of Diversity: Off-Campus Education in California*. Commission Report 80-5. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1980.

Appendix A

STATE OF CALIFORNIA GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Governor

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1020 TWELFTH STREET, THIRD FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814-3985
(916) 445-7933

September 23, 1987

Dr. Ralph Mills
Dean, Extended Education
Chancellor's Office
The California State University
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802

Dear Ralph:

Thank you for taking the time to meet with Bill Storey last week regarding the CSU Consortium program. As you know, the Commission is directed to review the CSU report and submit comments and recommendations to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee pursuant to the Supplemental Language (Item 6610-001-001) noted below:

> California State University -- Consortium Program. The California State University (CSU) shall report, by October 15, 1987, to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC), and legislative fiscal committees regarding the statewide consortium program. The report shall include recommendations regarding (1) the appropriate level of student fees and the appropriate degree of state support and (2) assurance that any program changes retain the statewide availability of the program, accreditation, and the current emphasis on nontraditional adult learners, off-campus sites, flexible scheduling, open-entry/open-exit curriculum, and opportunities to test out courses. The CPEC shall review the report and submit comments and recommendations to the JLBC and the fiscal committees by December 15, 1987.

Although CSU has officially disbanded the Consortium, it remains important that CSU address several topics:

(1) A comprehensive history of the Consortium, including a discussion of why the nontraditional format was arranged the way it was;

(2) A list of all programs offered by the Consortium, including information on each program's headcount enrollment, FTE, SCH, number of applicants, number of graduates, size and scope of its faculty and administration, and operating costs;

(3) The CSU's plan for accommodating Consortium students, both those currently enrolled and those previously enrolled who may return at some future date;

(4) The terms and conditions of transferring Consortium programs from the Chancellor's Office to the campuses, including the criteria for transferring specific programs to campuses;

(5) The provisions for administering both past and current student records; and

(6) The provisions for continued accreditation of Consortium programs.

Furthermore, it is important that the report respond in detail to several questions, including:

(1) **Accommodation** -- How will the CSU assure that Consortium students will be accommodated by the campuses in a spirit consistent with the Consortium's original nontraditional intent?

(2) **Funding** -- How would the CSU like to see the new Consortium programs funded? What justification is there for State funding, self-support funding, or a combination of both?

(3) **Access** -- Will the new Consortium programs continue to provide access for nontraditional students? What assurances can CSU give that campus-based programs will not rstrict access?

Although the State University may wish to address other topics and questions in its final report, the above topics are those that Commission staff believe are most important to the study.

Thank you again for the time you have devoted to this study. We look forward to receiving the final report by the October 15, 1987 deadline.

Sincerely,

Murray J. Haberman
Postsecondary Education Specialist

MJH:gs

cc: William H. Pickens
William L. Storey

Appendix B

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BAKERSFIELD · CHICO · DOMINGUEZ HILLS · FRESNO · FULLERTON · HAYWARD · HUMBOLDT
POMONA · SACRAMENTO · SAN BERNARDINO · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO · SAN JOSE
LONG BEACH · LOS ANGELES · NORTHRIDGE
SAN LUIS OBISPO · SONOMA · STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
(213) 590-

October 15, 1987

Mr. Murray J. Haberman
Postsecondary Education Specialist
California Postsecondary Education Commission
1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor
Sacramento, California 95814-3985

Dear Mr. Haberman:

Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of the report on Consortium Programs called for in the 1987 Budget Act. I trust that its content will be responsive to the issues raised in your letter of September 23rd.

In addition to the report, I am sending you Consortium self-study documents prepared in connection with the Spring 1986 WASC visitation. These documents will provide you with detailed information about The Consortium programs, faculty, financing, etc. The materials are current for January 1986. Nothing much changed after that time, except the fiscal picture. The decision to close The Consortium was made during late Summer, confirmed in Fall and put into action during the first half of this year.

In the following paragraphs, I will list the issues raised in your letter and provide a summary statement on each.

(1) A comprehensive history of The Consortium, including a discussion of why the nontraditional format was arranged the way it was.

Response: There is a brief history in the basic report. You will find additional historical information in the Institutional Self Study (ISS), particularly see pages 5-17.

(2) A list of all programs offered by The Consortium, including information on each program's headcount enrollment, FTE, SCH, number of applicants, number of graduates, size and scope of its faculty and administration, and operating costs.

Response: Data on students for the most recent five years is provided as Appendix C to the legislative report. Some additional historical perspective on Consortium programs is provided in the ISS, pp. 81-101. Financial resources of The Consortium are dealt with in the ISS, p. 169ff. See the ISS Appendices document, Appendix T, "Consortium Sources of Revenue and Operating Expenditures."

For "Faculty and Administrative Demographics," see the ISS Appendices document, Appendix P.

Operating costs for individual programs are not readily available and would require an inordinate amount of effort to reconstruct. The difficulty involved is compounded by the reassignment of Consortium staff to other responsibilities.

The cost information contained in Dr. Vandament's memorandum to the Presidents, dated October 15, 1987, was the result of one such effort. I've included a copy of Dr. Vandament's memorandum in the separate mailing..

(3) The CSU's plan for accommodating Consortium students, both those currently enrolled and those previsouly enrolled who may return at some future date.

Response: All continuing programs are now being operated by individual CSU campuses, except the B.S. in Business Administration program being offered in the community of Santa Barbara. Students, past and present, have been notified of the dissolution of The Consortium, the campus now operating the program, where their files are located, etc. In conneection with the Business program, provisions have been made for all students who have taken instruction in the program to complete their degree requirements by June 1989, provided they take the sequence of scheduled Business courses and related courses made available to them during this period.

See Appendix B of the basic report for Memoranda of Understanding under the terms of which Consortium programs have been assigned to individual campuses.

(4) The terms and conditions of transferring Consortium programs from the Chancellor's Office to the campuses, including the criteria for transferring specific programs to campuses.

Response: See Appendix B of the basic report to the Legislature and Memoranda of Understanding contained therein. Criteria utilized in transferring individual programs are discussed in the basic report, p.2 under "Disposition of Consortium Programs." Programs being transferred are, of course, Consortium programs, not programs of the Office of the Chancellor.

(5) The provisions for administering both past and current student records.

Response: Student records affiliated with programs transferred to individual campuses were transferred with the program to the receiving campus. Other student records, past and current, have been permanently assigned to the CSU, Dominguez Hills campus. Students completing Consortium degrees prior to June 30, 1989 will be serviced by personnel at the Dominguez Hills campus, as will students who have graduated in the past from The Consortium. Students have been notified about the permanent housing arrangements for their records.

(6) The provisions for continued accreditation of Consortium programs.

Response: See Item B, page 7 of the basic report to the Legislature.

In addition to the matters dealt with above, you have suggested that the report respond in detail to several questions with respect to accommodation, funding, and access. While I think the report deals adequately with these issues, what follows is an attempt to summarize and to elaborate on some points in greater detail, perhaps, than is called for in the report, itself.

Accommodation

All students pursuing degrees through The Consortium have been provided an opportunity to complete degree requirements, either under the auspices of The Consortium or through an individual CSU campus.

The CSU has sought to assure that students will be accommodated by the campuses in manner consistent with The Consortium's original intent by entering into Memoranda of Understanding with each campus adopting a program. The terms and conditions set forth in these memoranda protect the interests of Consortium students in a variety of ways. Campuses have agreed, for example, to accept all academic work completed under the auspices of The Consortium and allow students to apply such work toward the degree. In some instances, campuses, in adopting the programs, have made no significant changes in the program or its graduation requirements. In some instances, students will be afforded the option of receiving their degrees through The Consortium or through the campus. In other instances, only students being admitted to the program after the campus adoption will be expected to satisfy campus degree graduation requirements. They will be allowed to complete their academic work in accordance with Consortium requirements.

In the case of the B.S. in Health Care Administration, students have been admitted to the CSU, Long Beach campus. That campus is in the process of establishing an on-campus degree program in this field, where none previously existed. All work completed through The Consortium will be accepted toward the Long Beach degree.

No campus was found to be interested in adopting the B.S. in Business Administration. This program is located in Santa Barbara. Thirty-five students have completed one or more courses under the auspices of The Consortium by Summer, 1987.

This program poses problems for CSU campuses whose Schools of Business are accredited by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), and for campuses seeking to become accredited by the AACSB. (CSU campuses are urged to seek professional accreditation for all programs for which professional accreditation is available.) The accreditation standards of the

AACSB are such that accredited institutions find it difficult to operate off-campus degree programs. For example, the maximum teaching load allowed by the accrediting agency is twelve units, including any overload teaching assignments undertaken in self-supporting programs. Since the normal teaching load in the CSU is twelve, any campus attempting to offer an off-campus degree program on an overload basis would find it difficult to justify to the ACACSB. And since many CSU Business Programs are impacted on-campus, it is difficult to justify assigning work load in off-campus locations when it is not possible to meet the needs of on-campus students.

In addition, AACSB standards place limitations on the number of part-time faculty that can be utilized by a School of Business, making it difficult to staff off-campus programs with part-time people. Indeed, because of the shortage of qualified full-time faculty in on-campus programs, campuses find it necessary to utilize the maximum number of part-time faculty just to staff on-campus programs.

The AACSB holds that faculty who engage in research are more capable teachers. Thus, the accrediting agency urges full-time faculty to engage in research and to publish the results of their research. Since faculty in the CSU system teach twelve units per term, they are encouraged by campus administrators to spend what extra time they have available in research activities.

The Business program of The Consortium, being staffed entirely by part-time faculty, was not accredited by the AACSB. However, although several campuses were approached about adopting the B.S. in Business program in Santa Barbara, none was found that agreed to do so, citing accreditation issues as a primary factor in the decision.

In an effort to accommodate the thirty-five students who had completed at least one course toward satisfying Consortium degree requirements, the Office of the Chancellor sought a campus willing to offer the courses needed by these students to complete Consortium degree requirements. Since Consortium accreditation is expected to run through June, 1989, it will be possible to offer a sufficient number of courses to enable all students desiring to do so to complete their degree work and be graduated, as originally planned.

CSU, Stanislaus, which has not been accredited by the AACSB, has agreed to provide the needed courses, beginning in Fall, 1987 and ending in June, 1989.

Consortium student records will be maintained by staff at CSU, Dominguez Hills. The Stanislaus campus will send the transcripts of students completing Stanislaus courses to the Dominguez Hills Records Office where the credits will be posted on the students' permanent Consortium records.

Funding

All Consortium programs being offered by CSU campuses will continue to be self-supporting during 1987-88, with one exception. Students previously enrolled in The Consortium's B.S. program in Health Care Administration have been admitted to state-support courses being offered by CSU, Long Beach.

In some instances, campuses have requested that the adopted Consortium programs be funded by the state, beginning with FY 1988-89. In other instances, campuses expect to continue operating former Consortium programs on a self-support basis.

At present, it is the position of the CSU that students participating in non-traditional programs receiving General Fund support should pay the same fees as students pay who attend regular, state-supported on-campus programs and that in connection with programs for which state funding is being requested during 1988-89, state support should be provided on the basis of established budgetary formulae.

During this and the next fiscal year, staff in the Office of the Chancellor, in cooperation with the Dominguez Hills campus, will study fiscal and other policy issues relating to the effort to integrate The Consortium's non-traditional Statewide Nursing Programs into the General Fund program environment. On the basis of this experience, CSU may seek to effect such changes as may be necessary to enable non-traditional programs to operate effectively and efficiently within the General Fund.

Access

Consortium programs adopted by campuses will, in the main, continue to serve the needs of non-traditional students. Some, of course, will be discontinued because they have satisfied the need they were intended to serve and are no longer viable programs, without respect to the source of funding. In addition, CSU intends to study carefully the evolution of the Statewide Nursing Program as it operates through an established campus and as it is integrated into the state-support operation. The purpose of this study will be to determine how other non-traditional programs may be established to serve the needs of adult, part-time learners on a local, regional and statewide basis.

I think the CSU commitment to non-traditional students is well established, widely recognized and amply stated in the basic report to the Legislature. While little is said of on-going campus efforts to provide non-traditional program responses to the changing educational needs of the State, these efforts should not be overlooked. Consider, for example, how many non-traditional learners are being served through CSU's expanding instructional television services, through which on-campus courses are broadcast, live, to students in many off-campus locations.

If you need any additional information, please don't hesitate to contact me at (213) 590-5691 or ATSS 8/635-5691.

Sincerely,

Ralph D. Mills
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs (Acting)

RDM:pw:0162u

cc: Dr. W. Ann Reynolds
Dr. Lee R. Kerschner
Dr. John M. Smart
Mr. D. Dale Hanner
Mr. Louis V. Messner
Dr. William E. Pickens

Appendix C

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BAKERSFIELD · CHICO · DOMINGUEZ HILLS · FRESNO · FULLERTON · HAYWARD · HUMBOLDT · LONG BEACH · LOS ANGELES · NORTHRIDGE
POMONA · SACRAMENTO · SAN BERNARDINO · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO · SAN JOSE · SAN LUIS OBISPO · SONOMA · STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
(213) 590-

October 15, 1987

Dr. William E. Pickens
Director
California Postsecondary Education
Commission
1020 Twelfth Street, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Dr. Pickens:

Supplemental Language to the Budget Act of 1987 contains the following statement:

> The California State University shall report by October 15, 1987 to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC), and the legislative fiscal committees regarding the statewide Consortium program. The report shall include recommendations regarding (1) the appropriate level of student fees and the appropriate degree of state support and (2) assurance that any program changes retain the statewide availability of the program, accreditation, and the current emphasis on non-traditional adult learners, off-campus sites, flexible scheduling, open-entry/open-exit curriculum and opportunities to test out of courses. The CPEC shall review the report and submit comments and recommendations to the JLBC and the fiscal committees by December 15, 1987.

I believe this report is responsive to the request of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. If you have any questions regarding this material, please contact Dr. Lee R. Kerschner, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, under whose direction the report was prepared.

Sincerely,

W Ann Reynolds

W. Ann Reynolds
Chancellor

WAR:pw
Attachment

cc: Members, Joint Legislative Budget Committee (15)
The Honorable John Vasconcellos, Chairman,
Assembly Ways and Means Committee (2)
The Honorable Alfred E. Alquist, Chairman,
Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee (2)
Ms. Elizabeth C. Hill, Legislative Analyst
Ms. Jesse R. Huff, Director, Department of Finance
Mr. D. Dale Hanner
Dr. Lee R. Kerschner
Dr. James E. Jensen

THE CONSORTIUM
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

A REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The Supplemental Report of the Budget Act of 1987 (Chapter 135, Statutes of 1987) directs The California State University to report on Consortium Programs. More specifically, the Supplemental Report states that:

> The California State University shall report by October 15, 1987 to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC), and the legislative fiscal committees regarding the statewide Consortium program. The report shall include recommendations regarding (1) the appropriate level of student fees and the appropriate degree of state support and (2) assurance that any program changes retain the statewide availability of the program, accreditation, and the current emphasis on non-traditional adult learners, off-campus sites, flexible scheduling, open-entry/open-exit curriculum and opportunities to test out of courses. The CPEC shall review the report and submit comments and recommendations to the JLBC and the fiscal committees by December 15, 1987.

The requested report follows.

BACKGROUND

The Consortium of the CSU was closed on June 30, 1987. The closing of The Consortium was carried out in accordance with the standards of, and in consultation with, the executive leadership of the Senior Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, and with due regard for the protection of students pursuing degrees through The Consortium. Most academic programs of The Consortium have been transferred to the responsibility of individual CSU campuses.

Closure of The Consortium was undertaken following a determination that it could not achieve and maintain fiscal stability under its self-support mode of operation. Since its establishment in 1973, in excess of $2.4 million of Continuing Education Revenue Fund reserves has been provided to subsidize Consortium operations. In addition, outside agency grants in excess of $3.3 million have been utilized to underwrite the development of Consortium programs. Moreover, the determination was reached that the needs of students should be met through the mechanism of established campuses, whether on campus or on a local, regional or statewide scale. (For a brief history of The Consortium see Appendix A.)

Responsibility for Consortium programs and students has been transferred to individual CSU campuses, with two exceptions. One program has been phased out because students in the program were scheduled to complete all degree requirements during Summer 1987 and there was no longer a need for the program. In the case of the second exception, an opportunity will be afforded students in the program to complete all degree requirements by June 1989 and to receive their degrees through The Consortium. Instruction will be provided by individual CSU campuses though these campuses will not have full responsibility for the program. However, efforts to transfer this program to a campus are continuing.

Transferring responsibility for the non-traditional programs of The Consortium to individual CSU campuses does not signify a diminution of the CSU's commitment to non-traditional adult learners. Rather, it reflects a decision to lodge greater responsibility with the individual campuses for serving the needs of these students. Moreover, it calls upon individual campuses to be more sensitive, and more responsive, to students who are unable to take full advantage of traditional programs.

DISPOSITION OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAMS

In Fall 1986 campuses were surveyed to determine their interest in assuming responsibility for the academic programs of The Consortium. On the basis of this survey and following discussions with personnel at interested campuses, decisions were made concerning the disposition of each Consortium program.

The terms and conditions of transferring Consortium programs to campuses were, in each instance, spelled out in a memorandum of understanding signed by the Chancellor and the campus president or academic vice president (Appendix B). These memoranda stipulate: whether the campus will continue the program on a self-support basis; whether the program will be placed on a state-support status and, if so, when and under what circumstances; the authorized student fees for self-support programs; program delivery area; and the effective date of transfer. In addition, the document stipulates that the receiving campus will: permit the students to complete degree requirements in accordance with the policies and requirements of The Consortium or accept all work completed under the auspices of The Consortium and permit students to receive a campus degree; operate the program in accordance with all appropriate system and WASC guidelines. The document covers the disposition of active and inactive student records; notification of active and inactive students about program status and student records. Finally, any special conditions pertaining to the program are spelled out in these memoranda.

All permanent student records not transferred to individual campuses, along with program responsibility, have been transferred to the responsibility of CSU, Dominguez Hills. This campus will serve as the permanent repository of Consortium student records. Students have been notified.

In assigning Consortium programs to individual campuses, several points were taken into account: the ability of the campus to provide currently enrolled students an opportunity to complete all degree requirements; the willingness of the campus to continue the program for the benefit of other students; the proximity of the campus to program delivery sites; faculty and program resources of the campus; and, finally, the benefits that could be expected to accrue to the campus operating the program.

The disposition of each Consortium program is described hereafter. (Note: 1986-87 data not complete. Summer 1987 term figures have not yet been finalized. For 5-year data profile, see Appendix C.)

Bachelor of Science and Master of Science in Nursing (Statewide Nursing Program)

1985-86 BS data: 2,900 individuals; 620 FTES; 18,598 SCUs; 950 applicants; 234 graduates.

1985-86 MS data: 338 individuals; 43 FTES; 1,289 SCUs; 168 applicants; No graduates.

1986-87 BS data: 2,053 individuals; 473 FTES; 14,175 SCUs; 834 applicants; 322 graduates.

1986-87 MS data: 255 individuals; 66 FTES; 1,970 SCUs; 146 applicants; 13 graduates.

(Note: These data not complete as Summer, 1987 figures not yet finalized.)

Consortium Program Sites: Statewide.

Because of the unique character of the Statewide Nursing Program (which includes the B.S. and M.S. in Nursing), a decision was made to assign it to a single campus. The campus selected, following discussions with several, was CSU, Dominguez Hills. This assignment was made with the understanding that the campus would continue to operate this program on a statewide basis as a non-traditional program for working individuals. The campus will continue to operate both the B.S. and M.S. programs on a self-supporting basis through 1987-88. Efforts are underway to have the BOT consider placing the B.S. and M.S. on the CSU, Dominguez Hills academic master plan in January 1988. In addition, the campus FTES projections for 1988-89 includes 655 FTES for the Statewide Nursing Program. The campus proposes to operate this program within the context of its General Fund program in 1988-89.

Master of Public Administration (MPA) Program

1986-87 Data: 200 individuals enrolled; 49 FTES; 1,477 SCUs; 74 applicants; 33 graduates.

Consortium Program Sites: San Jose area; Los Angeles region.

Responsibility for the MPA program in the San Jose area has been assigned to San Jose State University (SJSU). CSU, Northridge has been assigned responsibility for the program in the Los Angeles region. Both campuses indicate they will continue to operate these programs and to do so on a self-support basis.

Master of Science in Quality Assurance (MSQA)

1986-87 Data: 87 individuals; 25 FTES; 741 SCUs; 57 applicants; No graduates (new program).

Consortium Program Sites: San Jose area; Los Angeles area.

San Jose State University (SJSU) has accepted responsibility for the program in the San Jose area. CSU, Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) will operate the MSQA program in the Los Angeles area.

Both SJSU and CSUDH will continue to operate the MSQA as a self-supporting instructional program until the program has been placed on the campus's academic master plan. Both campuses hope to operate the program on state-support in Fall, 1988.

Master of Arts and Bachelor of Science in Vocational Education (MAVE, BSVE)

1986-87 MAVE data: 15 individuals; 4 FTES; 108 SCUs; 22 applicants; 7 graduates.

1986-87 BSVE data: 30 individuals; 6 FTES; 186 SCUs; 2 applicants; 3 graduates.

Consortium Program Sites: Sacramento area; Stockton area.

Responsibility for these programs has been assigned to SJSU. The San Jose campus indicates that it will continue to operate these programs on a self-supporting basis during a phase-out period. Given the small number of students involved, the campus will ensure these students an opportunity to complete all degree requirements and close the program in the two locations involved. No new students will be accepted in these locations. However, new students may be admitted to the program in the San Jose area at some point in the future.

Master of Science and Bachelor of Science in Health Care Administration

1986-87 MS data: 151 individuals; 35 FTES; 1,029 SCUs; 48 applicants; 21 graduates.

1986-87 BS data: 32 individuals; 10 FTES; 303 SCUs; 19 applicants; 10 graduates.

Consortium Program Sites: M.S. in Los Angeles and Sacramento areas; B.S. in Los Angeles area.

Responsibility for the MS and BS in Health Care Administration has been transferred to the CSU, Long Beach (CSULB) campus. The campus is in the process of having its BS in Health Care Administration approved for implementation on campus and will serve all Consortium BS students through its state-support program. CSULB will continue to operate the MS program on a self-supporting basis, though it will phase out the program in the Sacramento area when students currently pursuing degrees have been given ample time to complete their degree requirements.

Master of Arts in Environmental Planning

1986-87 data: 32 individuals; 4 FTES; 120 SCUs; 6 applicants; 30 graduates.

Consortium Program Sites: Los Angeles Region.

The Consortium planned to close this program at the end of 1986-87. The final group of students was expected to complete all degree requirements at the end of the Summer Term, 1987. Therefore, this program has not been assigned to any campus and has been terminated.

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration

1986-87 data: 34 individual; 13 FTES; 390 SCUs; 22 applicants; 1 graduate.
Consortium Program Site: Santa Barbara area.

No campus has yet been assigned responsibility for the program. Discussions are continuing. In the meantime, arrangements have been made for selected CSU campuses to offer courses needed by students to complete degree requirements. Student records relating to this program will be maintained and serviced by staff at CSU, Dominguez Hills.

MAINTAINING THE NON-TRADITIONAL ASPECTS OF FORMER CONSORTIUM PROGRAMS

The Legislature called for assurance that any Consortium program changes retain their non-traditional aspects, including their: statewide availability; accreditation; emphasis on non-traditional adult learners, off-campus sites, flexible scheduling, open-entry/open-exit curriculum and opportunities to test out courses.

The Consortium operated only one truly statewide program -- the Statewide Nursing Program. Other programs were operated in from one to five locations.

Moreover, with the exception of the Statewide Nursing Program (SNP), programs developed and operated by The Consortium differ little in character from the self-supporting External Degree Programs offered by the CSU campuses for a number of years. The typical self-supporting External Degree Program consists of a series of appropriate upper-division or graduate-level courses offered to groups of students at times and places most convenient for them. When the required course sequence has been completed and other degree requirements are satisfied, the student is awarded a degree.

CSU campuses first developed such programs in the 1970's in response to the needs of individuals who, because of work and family commitments, were unable to take advantage of state-supported on-campus programs. The Consortium was established in 1973 to design and deliver degree programs responsive to needs that could not be met by individual campuses operating alone. The typical Consortium program followed the pattern being used by campuses to provide External Degree Program opportunities. To be fiscally viable, these programs must have a sufficient group of fee-paying students enrolled in each course to generate the revenues needed to cover all program costs. These courses generally require all participating students to attend class at the same time, in the same place. If the number of fee-paying students generates less revenue than is needed to cover the cost of the courses and the over-all program, then, the program must be discontinued. Thus, to offer a program of this kind, it is necessary to have and to maintain a "critical mass" of students in a group at the local level in order for a program to be continued. The needs of individual students or small clusters of students cannot be met by such programs.

Beginning in 1982, with funding provided by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, The Consortium developed a new approach to the design and delivery of instructional programs for registered nurses, based on adult learning principles. Instruction was carefully planned and "packaged" into one and two credit unit modules. Instructional packages for each module include video programs, audio tapes, and/or computer programs in addition to intensive print materials. Students use these materials to prepare for instructor-facilitated seminar meetings and to accomplish out-of-classroom learning activities. Under the guidance of a mentor (nurse a visor) students could pursue their individualized program of study at their own pace, in their own locale, often at their place of work.

With this modification in the delivery of instruction, it became possible for The Consortium to re-define "critical student mass" in statewide, rather than local, terms. The program could be delivered at sites with far fewer individual students than was the case in connection with other self-supporting external degree programs. This, in turn, permitted more flexible scheduling for students and greater openness within the curriculum.

Thus, the CSU has a tradition of commitment to the needs of non-traditional learners. It has demonstrated this commitment through the development of a variety of self-supporting and state-supported programs, including the unique Statewide Nursing Program.

The recently published report of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education contains a recommendation (Appendix D) which, in effect, recognizes the long-standing commitment of the CSU to part-time, non-traditional students. The recommendation reads, in part: "The California State University shall have responsibility for meeting the needs of older, part-time students who desire to pursue the baccalaureate degree." The recommendation also calls upon the CSU Board of Trustees (BOT) to "make whatever specific organizational changes are necessary to carry out" the system's commitment to working adults wishing to pursue baccalaureate degrees. Finally, the BOT is called upon to "review and, where necessary, adapt admission standards for older students to account for the skills and experience that are better measures of potential success than are out-of-date high school records."

Existing CSU policies and procedures, in connection with both self-support and state-support programs operating on- and off-campus, are consistent with these recommendations.

During the year ahead, the CSU will take steps to expand its commitment to non-traditional students pursuing baccalaureate degrees through both on-campus and off-campus programs. Evidence of the system's growing commitment to non-traditional students is reflected in a recent action taken by the Academic Senate, CSU. That body recently established a new standing committee on statewide programs. The new committee will be especially concerned with the academic policies and programs relating to the needs of part-time, non-traditional learners.

The Statewide Nursing Program

One of the most complex issues relating to the decision to close The Consortium was the future of the Statewide Nursing Program (SNP) which accounted for almost eighty percent of the overall Consortium enrollments during recent years. It was decided that the SNP should be preserved, along with its statewide service mission, and be transferred intact to a campus -- CSU, Dominguez Hills.

No single public California institution has ever administered an instructional program geographically dispersed throughout the state, much less one that offers professional undergraduate and graduate degrees at nearly 100 sites in

18 separate regions. Further, the adult learner education model developed and continuously refined by SNP since its inception in 1981 is a considerably different curricular delivery system than is offered by most public colleges and universities. Accordingly, it was anticipated, from the earliest considerations given to the possibility of assigning responsibility for the SNP to a campus, that a period of several years would be required to effect a successful transition, and that the effort would need to be undertaken in close cooperation and coordination between the Office of the Chancellor and the receiving campus. These principles were translated into a memorandum of understanding between the Office of the Chancellor and CSU, Dominguez Hills which outlines the conditions under which authority for the program was transferred to the campus on July 1, 1987.

Successful operation of this program within the General Fund budget will require resolution of policy and procedural issues relating to traditional, state-support programs. Such policies and procedures did not anticipate the special problems and needs associated with the delivery of non-traditional, state-supported, statewide instructional programs by a single institution. Accordingly, during 1987-88, a major effort will go into relocating and settling the SNP into a traditional campus environment, studying its existing operations and delivery system, determining where this program and the traditional state-support system fit and do not, and proposing such adjustments in either or both as may be required. If General Fund support is provided for SNP in 1988-89, as requested, there would be a continuing need to monitor the program's actual operation and experience in its new mode until policy and fiscal balance are achieved. Moreover, it is anticipated that the process of adapting the General Fund program, policy and fiscal environment to the operational needs of this highly successful program will produce a model to be followed in developing and operating additional non-traditional programs.

A. Statewide Availability

Of the Consortium programs, only the B.S. and M.S. in Nursing were offered on a statewide basis. Other programs were offered, at best, in four or five geographic locations.

The Statewide Nursing Program was transferred to CSU, Dominguez Hills with the understanding that it would continue to be operated as a non-traditional, statewide program. Provisions have been made for the establishment of the program in new locations throughout the state, where need can be demonstrated.

B. Accreditation

The Consortium was initially accredited by the Senior Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in 1976. As a result of a WASC visit in Spring 1986, The Consortium was placed on probation. In Spring 1987, WASC was notified of the decision to close the Consortium by terminating its operations and placing its programs with individual CSU campuses. In June 1987, WASC removed The Consortium from probation. However, to protect the interests of students yet to receive Consortium degrees for work to be completed through individual CSU campuses, WASC extended the accreditation of The Consortium through January, 1989. In subsequent discussions, WASC has indicated that it would be agreeable to extending this accreditation through June 1989, following receipt of a request for such an extension.

Programs transferred to campuses will be accredited through the receiving campus. WASC has been kept informed of the status of all Consortium programs. WASC officials have requested a further written report by January 15, 1988, and a special report on the Nursing Program transfer. Officials of the CSU, Dominguez Hills campus and of the Chancellor's Office have met with WASC officials to review the terms and conditions under which the Statewide Nursing Program was transferred to that campus. In addition, the Dominguez Hills campus will provide WASC a Notification of Substantive Change in connection with the adoption of the Statewide Nursing Program (SNP).

In addition to WASC accreditation issues, the Chancellor's Office and the Dominguez Hills campus are dealing with issues relating to the professional accreditation of the Consortium's B.S. in Nursing. This program was initially and fully accredited by the National League for Nursing in 1983. Under normal circumstances the program would not be reviewed again by NLN until 1991. To determine the impact of the transfer of this program to the Dominguez Hills campus, CSU representatives met with a consultant from the National League for Nursing. This meeting resulted in an understanding that the transfer would require a new initial accreditation through CSUDH, but that it could be done within a time frame that would not penalize students admitted on or after September 1, 1987. The campus is anticipating, therefore, that the Nursing Program will undergo a National League for Nursing visitation in February 1989, which if successful, would result in NLN accreditation that is retroactive to February 1988 for both the B.S. and M.S. in Nursing. While the Statewide Nursing Program remains under WASC accreditation, NLN accreditation would continue for currently enrolled undergraduate students who are completing degree programs started while SNP was a part of the Consortium.

C. Emphasis on Non-Traditional Learners

All programs operated by The Consortium were designed to meet the needs of non-traditional learners -- working adults unable to participate in regularly scheduled, state-supported programs operated by campuses.

It is the intention of the CSU to continue and expand its commitment to non-traditional learners through state-supported and self-supporting programs designed specifically for such learners.

In transferring Consortium programs to campuses, particular emphasis was placed on the relationship between the non-traditional learner and the Statewide Nursing Program (SNP). Whether the program operates on a self- or state-support basis in the future, system admission procedures are flexible enough to continue effective service for non-traditional learners. In terms of admissions policy, the most likely way to facilitate the admission of SNP (and other non-traditional) students will be through the existing adult special admission provisions of Title 5 (Sections 40756 and 40807). So long as applicants for admission to traditional or non-traditional programs have not been engaged in full-time college attendance for the previous five years, they could be qualified for admission under these flexible provisions.

Processing of applications for admission to non-traditional programs, such as the SNP, could be carried out under state support in essentially the same flexible manner it has been done under self-support. Current CSU contract registration policy, which permits applicants who are likely to qualify for regular admission but who for a variety of reasons may not be able to produce, immediately, all the documentation necessary to establish eligibility, i.e., transcripts, test scores, permits them until census date to complete the matriculation process. This practice could be adjusted administratively to permit non-traditional programs such as the Statewide Nursing Program to continue its practice of allowing students an entire term to establish. Since the overwhelming majority of such applicants are expected to be upper division transfers in adult special admission status, there would be no need for them to provide high school transcripts to complete matriculation into the state-support program.

D. Off-Campus Sites/Flexible Scheduling

Consortium programs continued under the auspices of individual campuses will be offered either on a self-support or state-support basis. Those offered on a self-support basis have considerable flexibility in both location and scheduling. Such programs can be offered in the location and at the time most convenient for the students.

As a campus-administered, state-supported program, the Statewide Nursing Program would continue its established practice of providing nursing courses in its existing network of off-campus sites, in cooperating hospitals and clinics throughout California. Additional instructional sites may be established on the basis of demonstrated need.

Based on data collected since the implementation of the Statewide Nursing Program, it has been determined that the typical RN admitted to the program requires between twelve and fifteen semester units of General Studies and/or elective credit to meet the overall requirements for an undergraduate degree. SNP students have been able to meet this need in three ways: intra-system enrollment at a participating CSU campus; enrollment in open university (concurrent enrollment); or enrollment at a community college when lower division credit meets the particular need. During the 1987-88 and 1988-89 academic years CSU, Dominguez Hills, in cooperation with Chancellor's Office staff, will seek to establish mechanisms within the CSU system and externally to ensure maximum flexibility for SNP students while at the same time creating incentives for other institutions to cooperate in the efficient realization of SNP student degree objectives.

Similarly, the flexible scheduling of sections to meet student personal and professional needs which has characterized SNP from the beginning should be expected to continue under campus administered state support. During the 1988 Spring term, CSUDH will experiment with a variety of scheduling modes and instructional locations to meet the needs of SNP student for degree-applicable units in disciplines other than nursing.

E. Open-Entry/Open-Exit Curriculum

Among the Consortium Programs only the Statewide Nursing Program had the flexibility to permit a convenient open-entry/open-exit curriculum. Every effort will be made to retain this characteristic of the program under the administrative direction of CSU, Dominguez Hills.

The instructional delivery system developed by the SNP permits adult learners to proceed toward their educational objectives at a pace consistent with their personal and professional cirucmstances. Three-unit nursing courses have been divided into one and two unit modules and sequentially scheduled. Modules typically last 6-8 weeks during which each unit of enrollment requires approximatley 45 hours of in-class and out-of-class learning activities. Students may enroll in as few as one module per term or as many as their personal circumstances allow. They do not lose continuing or active student status as long as they enroll in at least one module or degree-related course every other term.

F. Opportunities to Test Out of Courses

The Statewide Nursing Program, operating under the administrative direction of CSU, Dominguez Hills will continue to provide students the opportunity to receive credit for nursing courses by passing standardized examinations (e.g., those developed by the University of the State of New York Regents External Degree Program in Nursing). Beyond this, existing CSUDH policy permits a student to receive credit by examination for any course in which he/she is eligible to enroll, and provides a procedure by which this may be accomplished. Other campuses adopting Consortium programs have comparable testing procedures.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF STUDENT FEES AND THE APPROPRIATE DEGREE OF STATE SUPPORT

The Supplemental Report of the Budget directs CSU to include in this report "recommendations regarding . . . the appropriate level of student fees and the appropriate degree of state support." Recommendations relating to student fees and state support are dealt with separately in this section of the report.

Background

Formally approved off-campus instruction geared to the special needs of adult learners seeking to earn degrees through The California State University began in the early 1970's under conditions of self-support, i.e., students enrolled in off-campus or external degree programs were expected to pay fees sufficient to cover instruction and associated costs of program delivery. In less than a decade, however, attitudes within the CSU system and at the state level evolved to accept the notion that there should be equity in fees charged to students pursuing degrees on- and off-campus and that the location of instruction by itself should not be the basis for State funding decisions or fee levels.

In May 1976, following an extensive policy study undertaken by the Trustee Task Force on Off-Campus Instruction, the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution stating, in part, "that regular instructional programs may be offered at off-campus locations, provided that all rules and regulations concerning student eligibility to enroll, resource utilization and standards continue to be met and provided further that such offerings be limited to those for which there is adequate budgetary support" (Appendix E).

The Budget Act of 1978 directed CPEC to "define and study the various kinds of extended education with particular emphasis on degree oriented programs. Such study shall address questions of access, support, student needs, and quality." The mandated report (DEGREES OF DIVERSITY: OFF-CAMPUS EDUCATION IN

CALIFORNIA), was approved by CPEC and transmitted to the Governor and Legislature in March, 1980. This report provided a state level policy framework and process for phasing in state-funding for degree-oriented off-campus courses and programs. The report recommended that the level of state support for off-campus instruction should be sufficient to insure that students in state-supported external degree programs would be charged fees comparable to those for on-campus students; and to provide an adequate level of support services (Appendix F, expecially Recommendation 2, p. 99).

The recent report of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, THE MASTER PLAN RENEWED (July, 1987), contains a recommendation that the mission of The California State University include responsibility for the provision of baccalaureate level educational opportunity to the adult part-time student, and that the fees charged such students be determined and assessed on an equitable basis. More specifically, the recommedation (Appendix D) indicates that the state should fund "courses and programs leading to degrees for matriculated students, whether on campus or off campus."

A. The Appropriate Level of Student Fees

It is recommended that student fees for non-traditional programs be the same as fees charged students attending traditional, state-supported on-campus programs.

Background:

Fees paid by students enrolling in state-supported programs on campus and the fees required of students pursuing degrees in non-traditional, self-supporting programs, such as the Statewide Nursing Program (SNP), are not now equitable.

For example, from its beginning the SNP has operated on a self-support basis, charging fees to students on a per-unit basis for instruction in addition to a variety of service-related fees. Instructional fees went as high as $150 per unit in 1986-87, while the SNP was still housed in The Consortium. However, in 1987-88, the per unit fee was reduced to $138, mainly in response to indications that the cost was moving beyond the ability of many students to meet it.

At present, the primary fee paid by students regularly enrolled in The California State University is the State University Fee. It is non-tuitional and structured as follows:

	Per Semester	Per Quarter
0 - 6.0 Units	$ 183.00	$ 122.00
6.1 Units and Above	$ 315.00	$ 210.00

Other registration-related fees typically charged students in state-support programs are assessed without regard to the number of units in which a student enrolls. At CSU, Dominguez Hills (where the self-supporting SNP is now housed) the fees currently include:

	Fall Semester	Spring Semester
Student Activity	$ 15.50	$ 10.50
Student Center	20.00	20.00
Facilities	3.00	3.00
Instructional Related Activities	5.00	5.00
Totals:	$ 43.50	$ 38.50

Thus, a student enrolled for 6.0 or fewer units per semester at CSU, Dominguez Hills would pay a total registration fee of $226 in the Fall. If a student enrolled for 6.0 units or more, the total charge in the Fall semester would be $358.

Because of work schedules, family responsibilities, and the relatively high per-unit cost, the typical Statewide Nursing Program student takes three or less academic units per term. In 1987-88, the cost to the student for three units of instruction would be $414 in the self-support program. Additionally, under current self-support arrangements, each SNP student pays a one-time mentoring fee of $250.

In terms of equity for students, then, as well as for ease of administration, the preferred approach would be for SNP students and for students enrolled in other non-traditional programs to pay the same total registration fees as do all other matriculated students in the CSU taking a comparable number of instructional units. In this way, for example, SNP students would be able to take up to six units per semester for less money than they currently pay for two.

To the extent that high per-unit costs have been an impediment to SNP student progress and to the progress of students enrolled in other self-supporting non-traditional programs (and there is evidence that this has been the case), enabling these students to pay the same amount paid by students enrolled in state-support programs would reduce a significant access barrier and facilitate student progress toward graduation.

B. The Appropriate Level of State Support for Non-Traditional Programs

It is recommended that during FY 1988-89 state support for non-traditional programs within The California State University be provided on the basis of established CSU budgetary formulae.

During 1988-90 the Office of the Chancellor and CSU, Dominguez Hills intend to monitor the operation of the Statewide Nursing Program to determine whether current policies and procedures need to be modified in order to accommodate viable non-traditional programs at the local, regional and statewide levels. This work would be completed in time for preparation of the FY 1990-91 General Fund support budget.

Background:

In the 1988-89 General Fund budget request, funding will be sought for the Statewide Nursing Program (SNP) on the basis of a projected FTES of 655, calculated in accordance with established CSU budgeting formulae.

It is also important to note that the transfer of the Statewide Nursing Program to the Dominguez Hills campus did not include many of the formerly associated resources devoted to the instructional design and materials revision functions. In order to retain the currency of its curriculum and instructional materials, the program will need before the 1990-91 CSU support budget is finalized, to assess whether to budget for consultant assistance or to enhance its own capacity to maintain and update its unique curriculum and instructional materials. The latter approach could consist of one or a combination of: General Fund support specifically for this purpose; sufficient flexibility in SNP's ability to deploy its regular formula-generated state-support resources; or by reinvesting proceeds from the marketing of instructional materials, both within and without California.

CONCLUSION

It is clear that the postsecondary education needs of the State and nation are changing, requiring that education be made more accessible to individuals whose circumstances do not permit them to pursue their educational objectives on a full-time basis or come to established campuses. The California State University has a deep commitment to part-time students and has, over a period of many years, demonstrated its willingness to increase access to off-campus and part-time students through the establishment of self-supporting external degree programs, state-supported off-campus instruction, off-campus centers and, more recently, through instructional television outreach programs. Historically, a high percentage of the CSU's student population has been made up of older, part-time students.

Clear, too, is the increasingly important relationship between the educational currency of the state's professional and skilled workforce and the ability of the State's business and industrial communities to maintain their viability in an increasingly competitive world market. The California State University can respond most effectively to the on-going educational needs of the state's workforce through non-traditional programs offered at times and locations most convenient for older, part-time students.

While several self-supporting non-traditional programs are being offered in California by private postsecondary institutions, many of which are home-based outside California, these programs are generally expensive and beyond the financial means of many Californians who could benefit from having access to state-supported, non-traditional degree programs.

In response to the needs of such students, the CSU is committed to expanding access to its educational resources through the establishment of additional non-traditional programs. However, the experience of trying to provide non-traditional programs on a self-supporting basis through The Consortium has demonstrated, over the past decade, that if the needs of the state are to be met on an equitable basis, non-traditional programs must be supported by General Fund appropriations.

This experience validates the wisdom inherent in the resolutions and recommendations articulated by the CSU Board of Trustees (Appendix E), the California Postsecondary Education Commission (Appendix F), and the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (Appendix D) -- all of which urge equitable fees for non-traditional students and equitable General Fund support for non-traditional programs.

APPENDICES

A. Brief History of The Consortium

B. Memoranda of Understanding: Covering the Transfer of Consortium Programs to Individual CSU Campuses

C. Consortium Data by Academic Years: 1982-87

D. Statement from THE MASTER PLAN RENEWED Re: A Guarantee of Equity for Older, Part-Time Students

E. CSU Board of Trustees' Agenda Item and Resolution on Off-Campus Instruction (May 25-26, 1976)

F. Statement from CPEC Report, DEGREES OF DIVERSITY, Re: State Supported Off-Campus Degree Programs

APPENDIX A

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CONSORTIUM

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CONSORTIUM

In 1971 The California State University (CSU) established a Commission on External Degree Programs. This Commission was charged to advise the Chancellor on the development of external degree programs that would meet the special needs of individuals unable to participate in regular on-campus programs. It was also charged with developing alternative procedures for assigning credit and establishing programs more directly responsive to the needs of individuals not being met by traditional programs.

Studies undertaken by the Commission revealed the need for an institutional mechanism that would enable the CSU to utilize its combined faculty and program resources more effectively to meet the educational needs of citizens whose circumstances did not permit them to take advantage of campus-based academic programs and services.

Following extensive consultation with campuses, the systemwide Academic Senate and members of the Chancellor's staff, the Commission proposed the establishment of a consortium. The proposed consortium would permit the system to meet the need for regional and statewide programs and services that individual institutions were not able to provide, operating alone.

On May 22-23, 1973, the Board of Trustees of The California State University (BOT) acted to establish The Consortium. The Consortium was authorized to conduct academic programs utilizing combined faculty and program resources of the CSU and to award degrees. Programs offered by The Consortium were to be developed within the framework of the system's self-supporting instructional programs, where the direct cost of instruction would be covered by student fees.

At the same meeting, the BOT directed the Chancellor to prepare a request for an augmentation to the proposed 1973-74 General Fund budget to provide partial state support for The Consortium. The augmentation request was for funds to cover Consortium administrative and program development costs and to provide fee-waiver funds for eligible students unable to pay course fees relating to Consortium and campus-based self-supporting external degree programs. Ultimately, the funds requested were appropriated by the State, though not at the levels proposed. To cover Consortium operations additional supplemental funding was provided from the system's Continuing Education Revenue Fund.

The Consortium began operating in FY 1973-74. To ensure the academic integrity of Consortium programs, the systemwide Academic Senate was made responsible for advising and recommending to the Chancellor concerning the academic and administrative policies of The Consortium. To carry out these functions Academic Senate established the Consortium Advisory Committee.

A Director was hired to serve as the Consortium's chief administrative officer. The Director reported to the Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, through the State University Dean, Continuing Education.

Under the guidance of the Advisory Committee, systemwide program development committees were established in areas where studies indicated a need for regional and statewide programs. Program development efforts were guided by regular faculty of the CSU, selected from among campus faculties. Some non-faculty practitioners were also appointed to such committees. Feasibility committees were first established to determine the feasibility and desirability of establishing programs in areas where needs had been identified. Program development committees designed programs determined to be feasible. Academic Program Committees were established to oversee the operation of established programs.

During the second year of its existence The Consortium was again provided limited support by the State, to cover administrative and program development functions. Though later requests were made for General Fund support for The Consortium, after 1974-75 CSU received no further appropriations for this program. As a result, The Consortium continued to operate on a self-support basis and through grants and subsidies received from non-General Fund sources.

In 1976 The Consortium was accredited by the Senior Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges as the twentieth degree-granting entity of The California State University.

Although this new organization was officially designated "The Consortium," it never functioned in the consortial mode. Responsibility for its governance was vested, not in the cooperating campuses, but jointly in the Chancellor and the Academic Senate, CSU. However, from its beginning, The Consortium was viewed as a cooperative mechanism capable of drawing upon the resources of the CSU system in serving clientele that otherwise would not have been served. Indeed, until 1982, The Consortium depended entirely upon existing campus offerings for the courses that comprised its academic curriculum and relied upon campus Divisions of Continuing Education for the administration and operation of its self-supporting instructional programs.

In February, 1982, The Consortium underwent three fundamental changes intended to stablize its operations and to establish it as a separate CSU entity: first, the Director of The Consortium began reporting directly to the Chancellor; second, The Consortium began offering its own courses instead of relying upon cooperating campuses to offer courses that could be utilized to satisfy Consortium degree program requirements; and, third, The Consortium was authorized to hire its own part-time faculty.

Despite these and subsequent efforts to facilitate the mission of The Consortium, by 1986, it was becoming increasingly apparent that to maintain its fiscal viability The Consortium would have to increase its fees to levels beyond the means of the students the program was intended to serve. In that year, per unit course fees were raised to $150.

In addition, as a result of a visitation conducted by the Senior Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in Spring 1986, The Consortium was placed on probation. In a public statement issued on the matter, WASC noted that "the probation action was taken out of concern for the instability of the Consortium in respect to its mission, administration, and financial resources." WASC recommended, among other things, that The Consortium develop a stable financial plan that would include "substantial, regularized state support."

By Fall 1986 it was clear that The Consortium was no longer a viable operation and would have to be closed. It had become clear that The Consortium could not achieve and maintain fiscal stability in a self-support mode of operation. In addition, it was determined that the needs of non-traditional students could best be satisfied through campus-operated local, regional and statewide programs.

It was understood, however, that when closing The Consortium it would be necessary to protect the interests of students pursuing degrees through Consortium programs. Campuses were informed of the decision to close The Consortium and were asked about their interest in assuming full academic and administrative responsibility for Consortium programs and students, then numbering nearly 4,000.

WASC was notified of the decision to close The Consortium and place its programs and students, wherever appropriate, with CSU campuses. As a result, WASC acted to remove The Consortium from probation and to extend Consortium accreditation through January 1989. This extension is consistent with WASC policies on the closing of institutions and is done to protect the interests of students by enabling those in the process of completing Consortium degree requirements to do so through cooperating institutions and to receive their diplomas from The Consortium.

During Spring and Summer 1987, decisions were made concerning the disposition of all Consortium programs. One program was discontinued because the final group of students were completing final degree requirements during Summer 1987. With one exception, the remaining programs were transferred to the responsibility of CSU campuses. In the case of the exception, arrangements were made for all students participating in the program to complete their degree requirements prior to the expiration of Consortium accreditation.

The Consortium was closed on June 30, 1987.

APPENDIX B

MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING: COVERING THE TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAMS TO INDIVIDUAL CSU CAMPUSES

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BAKERSFIELD · CHICO · DOMINGUEZ HILLS · FRESNO · FULLERTON · HAYWARD · HUMBOLDT
POMONA · SACRAMENTO · SAN BERNARDINO · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO · SAN JOSE
LONG BEACH · LOS ANGELES · NORTHRIDGE
SAN LUIS OBISPO · SONOMA · STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
(213) 590-

MEMORANDUM August 24, 1987

To: Distribution

From: Ralph D. Mills
Assistant Vice Chancellor,
Academic Affairs (Acting)

Subject: Memorandum of Understanding: Transfer of Consortium Programs in Quality Assurance, Public Administration and Vocational Education to San Jose State University

Attached for your information and files is the endorsed Memorandum of Understanding under the terms of which responsibility for the following Consortium programs have been transferred to San Jose State University:

1. M.S. in Quality Assurance
2. Master of Public Adminstration
3. M.A.V.E. and B.S.V.E. and Designated Subjects Credential Programs

RDM:pw:3755
Attachment

Distribution:
Dr. W. Ann Reynolds
Dr. Herbert L. Carter
Dr. Lee R. Kerschner
Dr. John M. Smart
Dr. Gail Fullerton
Mr. Louis V. Messner
Dr. Anthony J. Moye
Dr. Donald W. Fletcher
Dr. Ralph Bigelow
Dr. Joan T. Cobin
Dr. Marilyn Crego
Ms. Jackie Baird
Dr. Arlene Okerlund
Dr. Ralph C. Bohn
Dr. Serena Stanford

400 GOLDEN SHORE, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4275 INFORMATION: (213) 590-5506

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

The attached Memorandum of Understanding pertains to the transfer of The Consortium Master of Public Administration program operating in the San Jose region to San Jose State University. The signatures affixed below signify that both parties involved in this transfer agree to all conditions and understandings contained in this document.

W Ann Reynolds
W. Ann Reynolds
Chancellor
California State University

8/24/87
Date

Gail Fullerton
Gail Fullerton
President
San Jose State University

7/24/87
Date

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

I. PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

Campus: San Jose State University

Program: Master of Public Administration

Campus Office(s)/Individual(s) with Oversight Responsibility:

Continuing Education: Robert Donovan
Ralph Bohn
Political Sciences: Larry Brewster
Douglas McIntyre

Program Status:

San Jose State University already has an MPA program. As a result, the Consortium program will be absorbed by the existing campus program and all students currently registered in the Consortium program will be integrated with the campus program. The program will operate as a self-support special session program for the 1987-88 academic year. The future interest of San Jose State University is to convert the program to FTES generation as an off-campus offering of the Political Science Department. Course fees for the 1987-88 academic year will not exceed $150 per semester unit.

Program Delivery Area:

Program will be delivered in the San Jose service area. Classes will continue to be held at locations convenient to the working adult student.

Effective Date of Transfer:

Transfer activities will be conducted by Consortium and SJSU campus personnel during the period from the date of this Memorandum to August 31, 1987. Final program transfer will be completed by September 1, 1987.

II. THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

The campus agrees to follow those appropriate WASC guidelines which pertain to off-campus instruction.

III. STUDENT STATUS

Active Consortium Students:

Consortium students Active as of September 1, 1987, who choose to continue their degree program with San Jose State University will not be required to apply for admission to the campus. These students will be permitted to retain catalog rights from the date of their admission to The Consortium, and will not be held to any program changes instituted by the campus. This will include Active students who hold Conditional Admission status. Active Student Status is defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog. Catalog rights for the MPA program are defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog, and additionally include all academic policy and curriculum changes which have been officially instituted after the student's admission to The Consortium. While original catalog rights will be guaranteed, students may instead elect to meet SJSU degree requirements, if approved by appropriate campus authorities.

The student's Program of Study will serve as documentation of degree requirements (see form attached).

All students graduating after September 1, 1987, will receive the SJSU degree.

The seven-year time limit on completion of courses toward the degree (as described in the SJSU Graduate Catalog, 1986-88, pp. 43-44) applies from the date of a student's admission to The Consortium.

Inactive Consortium Students:

Consortium students who do not qualify for Active status on September 1, 1987, but who wish to enter the campus MPA program will be required to apply for admission to SJSU and to meet the requirements for the degree as defined by the campus at the time of their admission.

Inquiries and Applications:

Inquiries and applications for admission to The Consortium MPA program which are received on or after the date of this agreement, will not be processed by The Consortium. Such applications and inquiries will be forwarded for follow-up to Dr. Larry Brewster, Political Science Department, San Jose State University.

IV. STUDENT RECORDS

Records on all Active and Inactive MPA students from the San Jose region will be transferred to Edgar Chambers, Associate Executive Vice President, Admissions and Records, San Jose State University, by September 1, 1987, or as soon thereafter as grades are posted. This will include all relevant back-up material such as final grade rosters and fee payment information. The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will oversee the transfer in cooperation with the campus designated office. Student records on graduates of the program from the San Jose area will also be transferred to the campus.

V. TRANSITION PROCESS

All program management becomes the sole responsibility of the SJSU campus on September 1, 1987. Prior to that date, Consortium personnel will work with designated campus personnel in preparation for the transition. The Consortium's Regional Program Director, Dr. Larry Brewster, will be available to assist in the process through August 31, 1987.

The Consortium central office will be responsible for completing all summer term course activity including posting of grades to the permanent record cards, sending grades to students, and paying instructors. Any grade changes (including completion of "I" grades) occurring after September 1, 1987, will be the responsibility of this campus.

Graduation Applications received prior to September 1, 1987, will be processed by The Consortium and the Graduation Fee will be retained by The Consortium to cover evaluation costs. Applications received thereafter will be forwarded to the campus for action.

VI. STUDENT NOTIFICATION

Active and Inactive students will be notified of the transfer of the MPA program to the San Jose State University campus by joint letter signed by the Director of The Consortium and Ralph Bohn. The letter will provide information per relevant sections of this Memorandum, particularly regarding the student's status in the program (Section III). Students having questions or needing advice will be asked to call Dr. Larry Brewster of the SJSU Department of Political Science. The department telephone number will be given in the letter. The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will be responsible for distribution of the letters no later than July 31, 1987.

VII. THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS ARE DESIGNATED AS THE APPROPRIATE CONTACTS DURING THE TRANSITION PROCESS:

Consortium	San Jose State University
Marilyn Crego Associate Director Academic Programs CSU Consortium	Robert Donovan Director Open University San Jose State University

7/24/87

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

The attached Memorandum of Understanding pertains to the transfer of The Consortium Bachelor of Science and Master of Arts in Vocational Education, and Designated Subjects Credential programs operating at locations in Turlock, Sacramento, Stockton, and at Mather Air Force Base to San Jose State University. The signatures affixed below signify that both parties involved in this transfer agree to all conditions and understanding contained in this document.

W Ann Reynolds

W. Ann Reynolds
Chancellor
California State University

8/24/87
Date

Gail Fullerton

Gail Fullerton
President
San Jose State University

7/24/87
Date

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

I PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

__Campus:__ San Jose State University

__Programs:__ Bachelor of Science, Vocational Education
Designated Subjects Credential
Master of Arts, Vocational Education

__SJSU Office(s)/Individual(s) with Oversight Responsibility:__

Continuing Education: Dr. Ralph Bohn, Dean of Continuing Education; James Beck, Director of Extended Education.

Division of Technology: Donald Betando, Director of Division of Technology; Dr. Ralph Bohn

__Program Status:__

The Bachelor of Science and Master of Arts degree programs and the Designated Subjects Credential will be transferred to San Jose State University. Programs in the Sacramento area will be phased out during the next two years, with the final discontinuance effective September 1, 1989. This phase-out period will allow reasonable time for all currently enrolled students to complete their degree or credential program. No new applications have been processed effective June 1, 1987.

The programs will continue as self-support external degrees. Course fees for the 1987-88 academic year will not exceed $150 per semester unit.

__Program Delivery Area:__

San Jose State University is authorized to deliver the programs at the following existing sites: Mather Air Force Base (B.S.), Turlock (B.S.), Sacramento (M.A.), Stockton (M.A.), and to other locations necessary to permit the students to finish the program. Efforts will be made to hold classes at locations convenient to the working adult student.

__Effective Date of Transfer:__

Transfer activities will be conducted by Consortium and campus personnel during the period from the date of this Memorandum to August 31, 1987. Final program transfer will be effective September 1, 1987.

II THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

San Jose State University agrees to operate these external degrees as pilot self-support programs. The campus agrees to follow those appropriate WASC guidelines which pertain to off-campus instruction and to operate the programs in accordance with the "Policies and Procedures for the Preparation of Proposals and Administration of External Degree Programs" (1978), including the following:

1. *Adequate learning resources, including library, computer and instructional media are available and will be used in direct support of the program.*

2. Adequate regular tenure or tenure track faculty will be available to insure that the program is taught and managed by individuals directly responsible to the host campus.

3. Existing campus standards regarding the academic quality of the program will be applied.

4. Grading standards currently in use by the University will be applied.

5. The campus additionally agrees to follow the guidelines established for the disposition of self-supported external degrees which have exceeded their pilot period (AA 79-14 and AA 81-10, attached).

The campus agrees to accept the curriculum of The Consortium program without substantive change. Major curricular changes which occur following transfer of this external degree shall be filed with the Office of Extended Education, Office of the Chancellor.

III STUDENT STATUS

Active Consortium Students:

Consortium students Active as of September 1, 1987 who choose to continue their degree or credential program with San Jose State University will not be required to apply for admission to the campus. These students will be permitted to retain catalog rights from the date of their admission to The Consortium, and will not be held to any program changes instituted by the campus. This will include Active students who hold Conditional Admission status. Active Student Status is defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog. Catalog rights for the B.S. and M.A. in Vocational Education and Designated Subjects Credential are defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog, and additionally include all academic policy and curriculum changes which have bee officially instituted after the student's admission to The Consortium. Active students will be given until September 1, 1989 to complete their degree or credential.

The student's Program of Study will serve as documentation of degree requirements (see forms attached).

All students graduating after September 1, 1987 will receive the SJSU degree or credential.

Inactive Consortium Students:

Consortium students who do not qualify for Active status on September 1, 1987 will not be eligible to enroll in the phase-out program.

Inquiries and Applications:

Inquiries and applications for admission to The Consortium BSVE, MAVE, or Designated Subjects Credential which are received on or after June 1, 1987 will not be processed by The Consortium. The Consortium office of Admissions and Records will inform inquirers and applicants that new students are not being accepted into the programs.

IV STUDENT RECORDS

Records on all Active and Inactive BSVE, MAVE, and Credential students from the authorized sites will be transferred to Edgar Chambers, Assoc. Exec. V.P. of Admissions and Records, San Jose State University, by September 1, 1987 or as soon thereafter as grades are posted. This will include all relevant back-up material such as Final Grade Rosters and fee payment information. The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will oversee the transfer in cooperation with the campus designated office. Student records on graduates of the program from the area will also be transferred to the campus.

V TRANSITION PROCESS

All program management becomes the sole responsibility of the campus on September 1, 1987. Prior to that date, Consortium personnel will work with designated campus personnel in preparation for the transition. The Consortium's Regional Program Director, Dr. William Harris, will be available to assist in the process through August 31, 1987.

The Consortium central office will be responsible for finalizing all summer term course activity including posting of grades to the permanent record cards, sending grades to students, and paying instructors. Any grade changes (including completion of "I" grades) occurring after September 1, 1987 will be the responsibility of the campus.

Graduation Applications received prior to September 1, 1987 will be processed by The Consortium and the Graduation Fee will be retained by The Consortium to cover evaluation costs. Applications for graduation received thereafter will be forwarded to the campus for action. Credential applications received prior to September 1, 1987 will be processed by the Consortium.

VI STUDENT NOTIFICATION

Active and Inactive students will be notified of the transfer of the BSVE, MAVE, and Credential programs to the San Jose State University campus by joint letter signed by the Director of The Consortium and Ralph Bohn. The letter will provide information per relevant sections of this Memorandum, particularly regarding the student's status in the program (Section III). Active students will be given one month from the date of this letter to indicate their intent to complete their degree with San Jose State University within the two year phase-out period. The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will be responsible for distribution of the letters no later than July 31, 1987.

VII THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS ARE DESIGNATED AS THE APPROPRIATE CONTACTS DURING THE TRANSITION PROCESS:

Consortium	San Jose State University
Marilyn Crego	James Beck
Associate Director	Director
Academic Programs	Extended Education
CSU Consortium	San Jose State University

7/24/87

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

The attached Memorandum of Understanding pertains to the transfer of The Consortium Master of Science in Quality Assurance program operating in the San Jose region to San Jose State University. The signatures affixed below signify that both parties involved in this transfer agree to all conditions and understandings contained in this document.

W Ann Reynolds

W. Ann Reynolds
Chancellor
California State University

8/24/87
Date

Gail Fullerton

Gail Fullerton
President
San Jose State University

7/24/87
Date

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

I. PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

Campus: San Jose State University

Program: Master of Science, Quality Assurance

SJSU Office(s)/Individual(s) with Oversight Responsibility:

Continuing Education: Dr. Ralph Bohn, Dean of Continuing Education; James Beck, Director of Extended Education.

Division of Technology: Donald Betando, Director of Division of Technology; Dr. Tom Little, Assistant Professor, Division of Technology.

Program Status:

Program will continue as a self-support external degree for the 1987-88 academic year. The current agreement between the campus and the Chancellor's Office is to place the program in the campus Master Plan beginning with the 1988-89 academic year. Thereafter, the off-campus phase of the program will be conducted as a special session program of the Division of Technology rather than as an external degree. Course fees for the 1987-88 AY will remain $150 per semester unit.

Program Delivery Area:

Program will be delivered in the San Jose State University service area. Current plan is to continue conducting classes at various area industry and other off-campus sites.

Effective Date of Transfer:

Transfer activities will be conducted by Consortium and San Jose State University personnel during the period from the date of this Memorandum to August 31, 1987. Final program transfer will be effective September 1, 1987.

II. THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

San Jose State University agrees to operate this external degree as a pilot self-support program for the 1987-88 academic year. The campus agrees to follow those appropriate WASC guidelines which pertain to off-campus instruction and to operate this program in accordance with the "Policies and Procedures for the Preparation of Proposals and Administration of external Degree Programs" (1978), including the following:

1. Adequate learning resources, including library, computer and instructional media are available and will be used in direct support of this program.

2. Adequate regular tenure or tenure track faculty will be provided to insure that the program is taught and managed by individuals directly responsible to the host campus.

3. *Existing campus standards regarding the academic quality of the program will be applied, including the establishment of representative advisory committees. Normally a broadly-based advisory committee consisting of appropriate elements of the administration, faculty, and the consumer is constituted to review matters of curriculum, and provide recommendations and advice to the Director and faculty of the program.*

4. *Grading standards currently in use by the regular graduate program will be applied.*

5. *SJSU additionally agrees to follow the guidelines established for the disposition of self-supported external degrees which have exceeded their pilot period (AA 79-14).*

San Jose State University agrees to accept the curriculum of The Consortium program without substantive change. Major curricular changes which occur following transfer of this external degree shall be filed with the Office of Extended Education, Office of the Chancellor.

San Jose State University accepts this program with the understanding that the CSU Chancellor's Office will place the M.S. in Quality Assurance on the Approved Academic Master Plan of San Jose State University during the 1987-88 academic year.

III. STUDENT STATUS

Active Consortium Students:

Consortium students Active as of September 1, 1987, who choose to continue their degree program with San Jose State University will not be required to apply for admission to SJSU. These students will be permitted to retain catalog rights from the date of their admission to The Consortium, and will not be held to any program changes instituted by the campus. This will include Active students who hold Conditional Admission status. Active Student Status is defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog. Catalog rights for the MSQA program are defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog, and additionally include all academic policy and curriculum changes which have been officially instituted after the student's admission to The Consortium. While original catalog rights will be guaranteed, students may elect instead to meet SJSU degree requirements, when approved by appropriate campus authorities.

The student's Program of Study will serve as documentation of degree requirements (see form attached).

The seven-year regulation on completion of the degree applies from the date of admission to The Consortium.

Inactive Consortium Students:
Consortium students who do not qualify for Active status on September 1, 1987, but who wish to enter the campus MSQA program will be required to apply for admission to San Jose State University and to meet the requirements for the degree as defined by SJSU at the time of their admission.

Inquiries and Applications:
Inquiries and applications for admission to The Consortium MSQA program which are received between July 1, 1987, and September 1, 1987, will not be processed by The Consortium. Such applications and inquiries will be forwarded to James Beck, San Jose State University, for follow-up. After September 1, 1987, all inquiries and applications will be forwarded to Tom Litte, Division of Technology, San Jose State University.

IV. STUDENT RECORDS

Records on all Active and Inactive MSQA students from the San Jose region will be transferred to Edgar Chambers, Associate Executive Vice President, Admissions and Records, San Jose State University, by September 1, 1987, or as soon thereafter as grades are posted. This will include all relevant back-up material such as Final Grade Rosters and fee payment information. The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will oversee the transfer in cooperation with the SJSU designated office.

V. TRANSITION PROCESS

All program management becomes the sole responsibility of the Division of Technology, San Jose State University, on September 1, 1987. Prior to that date, Consortium personnel will work with designated campus personnel in preparation for the transition. The Consortium's Regional Program Director (Dr. Ernie Unwin) and Associate Director (Mr. Robert Pinschmidt) will be available to assist in the process through August 31, 1987.

The Consortium central office will be responsible for finalizing all summer term course activity including posting of grades to the permanent record cards, sending grades to students, and paying instructors. Any grade changes (including completion of "I" grades) occurring after September 1, 1987, will be the responsibility of SJSU.

Graduation Applications received prior to July 1, 1987, will not be processed by The Consortium and the full Graduation Fee will be sent to SJSU by The Consortium. Applications received thereafter will be forwarded to SJSU for action.

VI. STUDENT NOTIFICATION

Active and Inactive students will be notified of the transfer of the MSQA program to the San Jose State University campus by joint letter signed by the Director of The Consortium and Ralph Bohn. The letter will provide information per relevant sections of this Memorandum, particularly regarding the student's status in the program (Section III). The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will be responsible for distribution of the letters no later than July 31, 1987.

VII. THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS ARE DESIGNATED AS THE APPROPRIATE CONTACTS DURING THE TRANSITION PROCESS (JULY 1 - SEPTEMBER 1, 1987)

Consortium	San Jose State University
Marilyn Crego	James Beck
Associate Director	Director
Academic Programs	Extended Education
CSU Consortium	San Jose State University

7/24/87

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BAKERSFIELD · CHICO · DOMINGUEZ HILLS · FRESNO · FULLERTON · HAYWARD · HUMBOLDT · LONG BEACH · LOS ANGELES · NORTHRIDGE
POMONA · SACRAMENTO · SAN BERNARDINO · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO · SAN JOSE · SAN LUIS OBISPO · SONOMA · STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
(213) 590-

MEMORANDUM August 4, 1987

To: Distribution

From: Ralph D. Mills
Assistant Vice Chancellor,
Academic Affairs (Acting)

Subject: Transfer of Consortium Master of Public Administration Program to CSU, Northridge

Attached for your information and files is the endorsed Memorandum of Understanding under the terms of which responsibility for the Consortium's M.P.A. Program in the Los Angeles region has been transferred to CSU, Northridge.

RDM:pw:3741
Attachment

Distribution:
- Dr. W. Ann Reynolds
- Dr. Herbert L. Carter
- Dr. Lee R. Kerschner
- Dr. John M. Smart
- Dr. James W. Cleary
- Mr. Louis V. Messner
- Dr. Anthony J. Moye
- Dr. Donald W. Fletcher
- Dr. Ralph Bigelow
- Dr. Joan T. Cobin
- Dr. Marilyn Crego
- Ms. Jackie Baird
- Dr. Robert Suzuki
- Dr. Richard Thompson
- Dr. James J. O'Donnell

400 GOLDEN SHORE, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4275 INFORMATION: (213) 590-5506

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

The attached Memorandum of Understanding pertains to the transfer of The Consortium Master of Public Administration program operating in the Los Angeles area to California State University, Northridge. The signatures affixed below signify that both parties involved in this transfer agree to all conditions and understandings contained in this document.

W Ann Reynolds
W. Ann Reynolds
Chancellor
The California State University

8/4/87
Date

James W. Cleary / BFH
James W. Cleary
President
California State University,
Northridge

7-28-87
Date

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

I PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

Campus: California State University, Northridge

Program: Master of Public Administration

Campus Office(s)/Individual(s) with Oversight Responsibility:
Department of Political Science - Dr. Warren Campbell and Dr. Christopher Leu
Office of Continuing Education - Dr. James O'Donnell

Program Status:
Program will continue as a self-support external-degree. Course fees for the 1987-88 academic year will not exceed $150 per semester unit.

Program Delivery Area:
California State University, Northridge is authorized to deliver the program in the greater Los Angeles area at the following existing sites: Los Angeles, Van Nuys/Ventura and Pomona. Classes will continue to be held at locations convenient to the working adult student.

Effective Date of Transfer:
California State University, Northridge will assume full responsibility for the program on July 1, 1987, pending full review by appropriate campus committees. Final program transfer will be completed by September 1, 1987.

II THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

California State University, Northridge agrees to operate this external degree as a pilot self-support program. The campus agrees to follow those appropriate WASC guidelines which pertain to off-campus instruction and to operate this program in accordance with the "Policies and Procedures for the Preparation of Proposals and Administration of External Degree Programs" (1978), including the following:

1. Adequate learning resources, including library, computer and instructional media are available and will be used in direct support of this program.

2. Adequate regular tenure or tenure track faculty will be provided to insure that the program is taught and managed by individuals directly responsible to the host campus. Normally, the ratio of regular faculty to adjunct faculty would not fall below one to one.

3. Existing campus standards regarding the academic quality of the program will be applied, including the establishment of representative advisory committees. Normally a broadly based advisory committee consisting of appropriate elements of the administration, faculty, and the consumer is constituted to review matters of curriculum, academic standards, and other appropriate matters.

4. Grading standards currently in use by the regular program will be applied.

5. An annual evaluation of this pilot external degree program will be submitted, following the approved evaluation plan. By virtue of this agreement, the campus agrees to submit (1) an evaluation plan and (2) the name of and qualifications of an unbiased evaluator prior to the end of the first term of campus operation.

6. The campus additionally agrees to follow the guidelines established for the disposition of self-supported external degrees which have exceeded their pilot period (AA 79-14 and AA 81-10, attached).

The campus agrees to accept the curriculum of The Consortium program without substantive change. Major curricular changes which occur following transfer of this external degree shall be filed with the Office of Extended Education, Office of the Chancellor.

III STUDENT STATUS

Active Consortium Students:

Consortium students Active as of July 1, 1987 who choose to continue their degree program with California State University, Northridge will not be required to apply for admission to the campus. These students will be permitted to retain catalog rights from the date of their admission to The Consortium, and will not be held to any program changes instituted by the campus. This will include Active students who hold Conditional Admission status. Active Student Status is defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog. Catalog rights for the MPA program are defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog, and additionally include all academic policy and curriculum changes which have been officially instituted after the student's admission to The Consortium. While original catalog rights will be guaranteed, students may elect to instead meet CSUN degree requirements, if approved by appropriate campus authorities.

The student's Program of Study will serve as documentation of degree requirements (see form attached).

All students graduating after September 1, 1987 will receive the CSUN degree.

The seven-year regulation on completion of the degree applies from the date of admission to The Consortium.

Inactive Consortium Students:

Consortium students who do not qualify for Active status on July 1, 1987 but who wish to enter the campus MPA program will be required to apply for admission to CSUN and to meet the requirements for the degree as defined by the campus at the time of their admission.

Inquiries and Applications:

Inquiries and applications for admission to The Consortium MPA program which are received on or after July 1, 1987 will not be processed by The Consortium. Such applications and inquiries will be forwarded to California State University, Northridge for follow-up.

IV STUDENT RECORDS

Records on all Active and Inactive MPA students from the Los Angeles area will be transferred to California State University, Northridge, by September 1, 1987 or as soon thereafter as grades are posted. This will include all relevant back-up material such as Final Grade Rosters and fee payment information. The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will oversee the transfer in cooperation with the campus designated office. Student records on graduates of the program from the Los Angeles area will also be tranferred to the campus.

V TRANSITION PROCESS

All program management becomes the sole responsibility of the campus on July 1, 1987. During the period prior to September 1, Consortium personnel will work with designated campus personnel in preparation for final program transfer. The Consortium's Regional Program Directors, Dr. Warren Campbell and Dr. Christopher Leu, will be available to assist in the process through August 31, 1987.

The Consortium central office will be responsible for finalizing all summer term course activity including posting of grades to the permanent record cards, sending grades to students, and paying instructors. Any grade changes (including completion of "I" grades) occurring after September 1, 1987 will be the responsibility of the campus.

Graduation Applications received prior to September 1, 1987 will be processed by The Consortium and the Graduation Fee will be retained by The Consortium to cover evaluation costs. Applications received thereafter will be forwarded to the campus for action.

VI STUDENT NOTIFICATION

Active and Inactive students will be notified of the transfer of the MPA program to the California State University, Northridge campus by joint letter signed by the Director of The Consortium and Dr. James O'Donnell. The letter will provide information per relevant sections of this Memorandum, particularly regarding the student's status in the program (Section III). The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will be responsible for distribution of the letters no later than July 31, 1987.

VII THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS ARE DESIGNATED AS THE APPROPRIATE CONTACTS DURING THE TRANSITION PROCESS:

Consortium	California State University, Northridge
Dr. Joan Cobin	Dr. James O'Donnell Dr. Christopher Leu and Dr. Warren Campbell

VIII ADDITIONAL ISSUES AND CONDITIONS (as needed)

IPDC #1 A-8MEMO
7-17-87

PROGRAM OF STUDY MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Name ______________________ (Last) ______________________ (First) Phone ____________ File No. ____________

Address ______________________ (Street) ______________________ (City) ____________ (Zip)

Graduate of ______________________ Date ______________________ Degree/Major ______________________

Requirements for the degree: Minimum of 30 semester units plus graduate project or thesis; 3.0 minimum GPA.

I. Prerequisites: P.A. 400 Basic Statistics in Public Administration, or equivalent (prerequisite to P.A. 520)

List course which has been used to meet this requirement ______________________

NOTE: If transfer course has been used to meet this requirement, please indicate by listing school of transfer, course department and number.

A. Completion of the following seminars is required: (18 semester units)

	Units	Grade		Units	Grade
P.A. 510	3		P.A. 540	3	
P.A. 520	3		P.A. 550	3	
P.A. 530	3		P.A. 560	3	

B. 1. Electives (Advanced Tutorials): 12 semester units in at least three of the five core areas; P.A. 543 or 544 required as part of the 12 units. 2. Employment Studies Option: P.A. 535, 545, 546 and 555 required.

Course Dept. & No.	Units	Grade	Course Dept. & No.	Units	Grade

NOTE: If transfer courses have been used to meet any requirement(s) of A. and/or B., please indicate by listing school of transfer, course department and number.

C. Program Option (mark one): ~~P.A. 591 Thesis~~ ☐ P.A. ~~592~~ 690/Graduate Project ☐ Comprehensive Examination ☐

Topic: ______________________

____

Mentor: ______________________ Date Outline Approved: ______________________

II. Admission to Classified Standing: ______________________ Candidacy: ______________________

III. Signatures:

Student ______________________ Date: ____________

Advisor ______________________ Date: ____________

Program Director ______________________ Date: ____________

THE CONSORTIUM OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
6300 State University Drive, Long Beach, CA 90815-4608 (213) 498-4119

IV. NOTE: This form should be completed by the time the student is advanced to candidacy. After signing, distribute as follows:

Original	(White)	Consortium A. & R. Office
Duplicate	(Yellow)	Student
Triplicate	(Pink)	Adviser

Replaces all previous editions of this form.

[illegible] MPA REV 11/[illegible]

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802
(213) 590- 5691

Code: AA 81-10

Date: March 9, 1981

To: PRESIDENTS

From: Dr. Alex C. Sherriffs
Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Subject: Guidelines for Conversion of Existing Self-Support External Degree Programs to General Fund Support

The guidelines which follow were developed to provide assistance and direction to campuses for conversion of self-support baccalaureate external degree programs. Campuses which opt to convert a degree program should normally meet all of the criteria contained within these guidelines.

A separate proposal for each degree program to be converted should be submitted. If you have questions or require additional information, please contact Dr. Ralph D. Mills, State University Dean, Extended Education, at (213) 590-5691 or 8-635-5691.

These guidelines are issued in response to recommendations of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) and Supplementary 1980-81 Budget Act language of the Legislature. They have been developed to assist campuses in the conversion of self-support external degree programs as well as to assure that legislative intent and CPEC recommendations are honored.

Distribution: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Deans, Academic Planning
Deans, Extended/Continuing Education
Chancellor's Office Staff

AA 80-16 (BA 80-26) which promulgated the Guidelines for Reporting Procedures pertaining to State Supported Instruction in Off-Campus Locations, outlined the general recommendations of CPEC and the reporting requirements established by the supplemental budget act language.

The Legislature received the CPEC report on off-campus education, Degrees of Diversity, in March, 1980. The recommendations contained in the CPEC report were accepted by the Legislative Budget Committees. Recommendations having implications for the conversion of self-supporting campus-based external degree programs are summarized as follows:

1. In providing funding for the off-campus programs, the Governor and the Legislature should give priority to:
    a. Degree programs, in preference to courses not leading to a degree at a single locale.
    b. Upper division courses, in preference to graduate courses.
    c. Geographic areas and educational needs not presently served by accredited independent colleges and universities.
2. In The California State University and Colleges, consistent with Recommendation 1, State support for external degree programs should be limited to the following numbers of students:

1980-81	1,600	Full-Time-Equivalent Students
1981-82	2,100	Full-Time-Equivalent Students
1982-83	2,600	Full-Time-Equivalent Students

In keeping with these recommendations, campus-based self-support external baccalaureate degree programs are eligible for conversion, provided the campus does not exceed its allocated state-supported off-campus FTES (AA 80-16 and BA 80-26).

In addition to the general limitations above, conversion and operation of CSUC self-support campus-based external degree programs shall be governed by the following guidelines and understandings.

Programs proposed for conversion to General Fund Support will require the approval of the Chancellor and they must meet the following criteria:

1. Be a program leading to a baccalaureate degree offered in a single locale (Certificate and Master's degree programs will normally not be considered for conversion unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated).
2. There shall be a clear and demonstrable need for the program, such that at least one complete cycle of courses would allow completion of the degree program within a reasonable period of time.
3. The program shall be one which serves the general public rather than a closed group of corporate or agency employees or military personnel.
4. Program admission and graduation requirements as well as all other academic regulations shall be consistent with those required for on-campus programs.
5. Learning resources at the site of instruction shall be adequate to maintain program integrity and academic quality.
6. The program must meet WASC standards for off-campus instruction with regard to program coordination, academic advisement, student counseling; and other student support services.
7. Program courses shall be staffed in accordance with the accepted faculty staffing patterns of General Fund supported programs.
8. Conversion of a given program shall not result in exceeding the campus FTES allocation for off-campus instruction.
9. The program to be converted should be one that appears on the approved campus Academic Master Plan.
10. Conversion shall have no effect upon campus enrollment allocations for that budget year.

11. There shall be evidence that the financial impact on the campus General Fund resources and the Continuing Education Revenue Fund have been thoroughly evaluated.

12. The needs of students within the self-support program shall be protected; there shall be evidence of compliance with all legal requirements and good faith obligations.

Programs meeting the above criteria will not be converted to state support automatically. Proposals must include evidence that the criteria above have been met. They should be addressed to Dr. Ralph D. Mills, State University Dean, Extended Education and received at least one full term prior to the anticipated conversion date.

ACS:jcr

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802
(213) 590-5708

Robert O. Bess ✓

Code: AA 79-14

Date: May 11, 1979

To: Vice Presidents of
Academic Affairs

From: Alex C. Sherriffs
Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Subject: Procedures for Handling Pilot External Degree Programs at the Conclusion of Their Pilot Periods

Attached please find the recently adopted procedures for handling self-supporting pilot external degree programs at the conclusion of their initially defined pilot period. These procedures were developed by the Commission on Extended Education and reviewed by Academic Affairs staff, the Academic Senate, appropriate campus personnel and the CCOP. They become effective during the 1978-79 academic year.

All self-supporting external degree programs, including those now currently operational which are already beyond their initial pilot period, are now subject to these procedures. I am requesting that for those programs which have already gone beyond their pilot period that the campus submit its request that the program be terminated, have its pilot period extended, or that it be converted to "regular" external degree status at your earliest convenience.

Please direct any questions regarding this matter to Dean Ralph D. Mills or Dr. Donald W. Fletcher.

ACS:pw
Attachment

Distribution
Chancellor's Office Staff
Deans of Extended/Continuing Education
Chairs, Academic Senates

Trustees California State
University and Colleges
MAY 21 1979
ACADEMIC PROJECTS

PROCEDURES FOR ACTION AT THE CONCLUSION OF EXTERNAL DEGREE PILOT PERIODS

I. Assumptions

A. Policy Authorization

Authority has been delegated to the Chancellor to approve 1) pilot external degree programs and 2) degree programs which the Trustees have endorsed in principal on the Academic Master Plan.

B. Policy Administration

Accordingly, procedures will be administrative ones, subject to approval of the Chancellor and administered by the Chancellor. The recommended procedures would be implemented by the Division of Extended Education in cooperation with the Division of Educational Programs and Resources when Academic Master Plan revision is involved.

C. Standardized Data Collection

Enrollment data, faculty data and financial data will be collected annually in a standard format for every self-support external degree program, regardless of its status. These data will be available for all evaluation activities, and will not have to be specificially requested.

D. Annual Evaluation Report

A series of annual evaluation reports which were conducted during the pilot period will be available.

E. Support of External Degree Programs

It is assumed that external degree programs will remain self-supporting until authorization is obtained for state support. The currently proposed procedures would need some modification in cases where conversion to state support is planned.

II. Procedures

Prior to the expiration of the pilot period, the Division of Extended Education will inquire about campus intent with respect to each pilot external degree program. Three alternatives are possible:

1) Termination of the program (i.e., cessation of new admissions)
2) Extension of the pilot period
3) Conversion to permanent status as an external degree program listed on the Academic Master Plan for the campus. The campus decision shall be made in accordance with established curricular review procedures

A. Termination of Pilot Programs

1. Criteria for review and approval of campus request
   a. Protection of in-progress students
   b. Compliance with all legal requirements, commit-

c. For occupational programs, evidence of sustained employment or inservice training demand
d. Project[illegible]anges in composition of faculty and num[illegible] faculty positions
e. Itemization of current and proposed sites (for inclusion in the Academic Master Plan)
f. Assessment of financial impact on campus Continuing Education Revenue Fund in terms of campus' capacity to sustain other self-support programs
g. Proposed evaluation schedule and explanation of any changes in evaluation procedures. It is assumed that normal campus review procedures would be followed.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BAKERSFIELD · CHICO · DOMINGUEZ HILLS · FRESNO · FULLERTON · HAYWARD · HUMBOLDT · LONG BEACH · LOS ANGELES · NORTHRIDGE
POMONA · SACRAMENTO · SAN BERNARDINO · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO · SAN JOSE · SAN LUIS OBISPO · SONOMA · STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
(213) 590-

MEMORANDUM July 31, 1987

To: Distribution

From: Ralph D. Mills
Assistant Vice Chancellor,
Academic Affairs (Acting)

Subject: Transfer of Consortium M.S. in Quality Assurance to CSU, Dominguez Hills

Attached for your information and files is the endorsed Memorandum of Understanding under the terms of which responsibility for the Consortium's M.S. Program in Quality Assurance in the Los Angeles region has been transferred to the responsibility of CSU, Dominguez Hills.

RDM:pw:3741
Attachment

Distribution:
- Dr. W. Ann Reynolds
- Dr. Herbert L. Carter
- Dr. Lee R. Kerschner
- Dr. John M. Smart
- Dr. John A. Brownell
- Mr. Louis V. Messner
- Dr. Anthony J. Moye
- Dr. Donald W. Fletcher
- Dr. Ralph Bigelow
- Dr. Joan T. Cobin
- Dr. Marilyn Crego
- Ms. Jackie Baird
- Dr. James G. Harris
- Dr. Sam Wiley
- Dr. Joseph W. Braun
- Dr. Gary Levine
- Dr. Dennis Fusi
- Dr. Robert Dowling

400 GOLDEN SHORE, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4275 INFORMATION: (213) 590-5506

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF THE CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

The attached Memorandum of Understanding pertains to the transfer of The Consortium Master of Science in Quality Assurance program operating in Los Angeles and Orange Counties to California State University, Dominguez Hills. The signatures affixed below signify that both parties involved in this transfer agree to all conditions and understandings contained in this document.

W Ann Reynolds	John A Brownell
W. Ann Reynolds Chancellor The California State University	Jack Brownell Acting President California State University, Dominguez Hills
Date: 7/21/87	Date: 7/6/87

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

I PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

Campus: California State University, Dominguez Hills
Program: Master of Science, Quality Assurance
Campus Office(s)/Individual(s) with Oversight Responsibility:

Extended Education
Dean, Science, Mathematics, and Technology

Program Status:
Program will continue as a self-support external degree for the 1987-88 academic year. Current plan is to submit program for inclusion in campus Master Plan beginning with the 1988-89 academic year. Course fees for the 1987-88 AY will remain at $150 per semester unit.

Program Delivery Area:
Program will be delivered at existing industry sites within Los Angeles and Orange Counties; namely, at Hughes Learning Center, Garrett Airesearch, University High School, and at other off-campus locations to be developed.

Effective Date of Transfer:
Transfer activities will be conducted by The Consortium and California State University, Dominguez Hills personnel during the period from the date of this Memorandum to August 30, 1987. Final program transfer will be effective August 31, 1987 (Fall term, 1987).

II THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

California State University, Dominguez Hills agrees to operate this external degree as a pilot self-support program. The campus agrees to follow those appropriate WASC guidelines which pertain to off-campus instruction and to operate this program in accordance with the "Policies and Procedures for the Preparation of Proposals and Administration of External Degree Programs" (1978), including the following:

1. Adequate learning resources, including library, computer and instructional media are available and will be used in direct support of this program.

2. Adequate involvement of regular tenure or tenure track faculty will be maintained to insure that the program is taught and managed by individuals directly responsible to the host campus.

3. Existing campus standards regarding the academic quality of the program will be applied, including the establishment of representative advisory committees. Normally a broadly based advisory committee consisting of appropriate elements of the administration, faculty, and the consumer is constituted to review matters of curriculum, academic standards, and other appropriate matters.

4. Grading standards currently in use by regular on-campus programs will be applied.

5. An annual evaluation of this pilot external degree program will be submitted, following the approved evaluation plan. By virtue of this agreement the campus agrees to submit (1) an evaluation plan and (2) the name of and qualifications of an unbiased evaluator prior to the end of the first term of campus operation.

6. The campus additionally agrees to follow the guidelines established for the disposition of self-supported external degrees which have exceeded their pilot period (AA 79-14 and AA 81-10, attached).

California State University, Dominguez Hills agrees to accept the curriculum of The Consortium program without substantive change. Major curricular changes which occur following transfer of this external degree shall be filed with the Office of Extended Education, Office of the Chancellor.

III STUDENT STATUS

Active Consortium Students:

Consortium students Active as of August 31, 1987 who choose to continue their degree program with California State University, Dominguez Hills will not be required to apply for admission to CSUDH. These students will be permitted to retain catalog rights from the date of their admission to The Consortium, and will not be held to any program changes instituted by the campus. This will include Active students who hold Conditional Admission status. Active Student Status is defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog. Catalog rights for the MSQA program are defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog, and additionally include all academic policy and curriculum changes which have been officially instituted after the student's admission to The Consortium. While original catalog rights will be guaranteed, students may elect to instead meet CSUDH degree requirements, if approved by appropriate campus authorities.

The student's Program of Study will serve as documentation of degree requirements (see form attached).

The seven-year regulation on completion of the degree applies from the date of admission to The Consortium.

Inactive Consortium Students:

Consortium students who do not qualify for Active status on August 31, 1987 but who wish to enter the campus MSQA program will be required to apply for admission to California State University, Dominguez Hills and to meet the requirements for the degree as defined by the campus at the time of their admission.

Inquiries and Applications:

Inquiries and applications for admission to The Consortium MSQA program which are received on or after July 1, 1987 will not be processed by The Consortium. Such applications and inquiries will be forwarded to Office of Extended Education California State University, Dominguez Hills, for follow-up.

IV STUDENT RECORDS

Records on all Active and Inactive MSQA students from the Southern California area will be transfered to Office of the Registrar California State University, Dominguez Hills, by September 1, 1987 or as soon thereafter as grades are posted. This will include all relevant back-up material such as Final Grade Rosters and fee payment information. The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will oversee the transfer in cooperation with the CSUDH designated office.

V TRANSITION PROCESS

All program management becomes the sole responsibility of California State University, Dominguez Hills on August 31, 1987. Prior to that date, Consortium personnel will work with designated campus personnel in preparation for the transition. The Consortium's Regional Program Directors (Dr. Andy Bazar and Dr. Phillip Rosenkrantz) will be available to assist in the process through August 31, 1987.

The Consortium central office will be responsible for finalizing all summer term course activity including posting of grades to the permanent record cards, sending grades to students, and paying instructors. Any grade changes (including completion of "I" grades) occurring after September 1, 1987 will be the responsibility of CSUDH.

VI STUDENT NOTIFICATION

Active and Inactive students will be notified of the transfer of The MSQA program to the California State University, Dominguez Hills campus by joint letter signed by the Director of The Consortium and President, CSUDH. The letter will provide information per relevant sections of this Memorandum, particularly regarding the student's status in the program (Section III). The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will be responsible for distribution of the letters no later than August 1, 1987.

VII THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS ARE DESIGNATED AS THE APPROPRIATE CONTACTS DURING THE TRANSITION PROCESS:

Consortium	California State University, Dominguez Hills
Dr. Joan Cobin	Joseph Braun Gary R. Levine

D#2-A-6MEMO
6-14-87

PROGRAM OF STUDY
MASTER OF SCIENCE QUALITY ASSURANCE

NAME	(Last)	(First)	(M.I.)	Social Security Number	Date	Program

Mailing Address	(Street)	(City)	(State)	(Zip Code)

Phone (Home)	(Work)	Proposed Graduation Date	Number of Units Transferred into Program

Requirements for the degree*

1. 33 semester units of approved graduate work, with minimum of 3.0 GPA
2. 21 semester units in residence with The Consortium
3. Major courses listed below
4. Graduate Culminating Project
5. Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)

I. PREREQUISITE AREAS OF COMPETENCE (Admission Requirement)	COMPLETE ON ADMISSION	DATE COMPLETED	COURSE & INSTITUTION	BY EXAM	OFFICE USE ONLY
CALCULUS					
CHEMISTRY (Basic)					
PHYSICS (Fundamentals)					
PROBABILITY & STATISTICS					
COMPUTER CONCEPTS					

CURRENT DEMONSTRATION OF MATHEMATICS/STATISTICS COMPETENCE

EXAM PASSED DATE

QA 500 COMPLETED DATE

SPECIAL ACTIONS: CONDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS	UNITS	MET	TIME
COURSE & INSTITUTION			

II. REQUIRED CORE COURSES	PLANNED DATE OF COMPLETION	DATE COMPLETED	COURSE & INSTITUTION	COURSE SUBSTITUTION DATE**	UNITS	RESIDENCE CREDIT	OFFICE USE ONLY
QA 511 QUALITY PROJECT MGMT. & PLANNING (3)							
QA 512 SYSTEMS RELIABILITY (3)							
QA 513 STATISTICAL QUALITY CONTROL & SAMPLING (3)							
QA 514 ADVANCED EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN							
QA 515 HUMAN FACTORS IN QA (3)							
QA 516 MEASUREMENT & TESTING TECH. (3)							
QA 517 QUALITY COST ANALYSIS (3)							
QA 518 QUALITY ADMIN. & PRODUCTIVITY (3)							
III. ELECTIVES (Student selects one with advisor approval)							
QA 621 PROCESS CONTROL & CAPABILITY (3)							
QA 622 APPLIED SYS. REL., MAINTAINABILITY, & SAFETY (3)							
QA 623 SOFTWARE QUALITY CONTROL (3)							
QA 624 COMPUTER AIDED QUALITY CONTROL (3)							
IV. QA [illegible] SPECIAL TOPICS (3)							
V. QA [illegible] GRAD. PROJECT (3)							
TITLE:							

VI. REQUIREMENTS MET	
A. PREREQUISITE AREAS OF COMPETENCE	DATE
B. GWAR	DATE
C. RESIDENCE	DATE
D. MAJOR COURSES	DATE
E. TOTAL UNITS	DATE
F. GRADUATE PROJECT	DATE

VII. INITIAL PLANNING

STUDENT SIGNATURE DATE

ADVISOR/MENTOR SIGNATURE DATE

VIII. FINAL ADVISING

STUDENT SIGNATURE DATE

ADVISOR/MENTOR SIGNATURE DATE

R.P.D. SIGNATURE DATE

IX. FINAL REVIEW

DATE

* SEE CATALOG FOR COMPLETE PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND REQUIREMENTS
** RESIDENCY/TRANSFER FORM MUST BE ATTACHED FOR ALL NON-CONSORTIUM COURSES. ALL TRANSFER SUBSTITUTION COURSES MUST HAVE A GRADE OF "B" OR BETTER

THE CONSORTIUM of The California State University
6300 State University Drive, Long Beach, CA 90815-4666
(213) 498-4119 or 1-800-352-7517 (Toll free for California residents only)

DISTRIBUTION: WHITE: A&R GREEN: STUDENT YELLOW: R.P.D. PINK: R.P.D.(Initial Planning) GOLD: STUDENT (Initial Planning) 12/88

STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802

(213) 590- 5691

Code: AA 81-10

Date: March 9, 1981

To: PRESIDENTS

From: Dr. Alex C. Sherriffs
Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Subject: Guidelines for Conversion of Existing Self-Support External Degree Programs to General Fund Support

The guidelines which follow were developed to provide assistance and direction to campuses for conversion of self-support baccalaureate external degree programs. Campuses which opt to convert a degree program should normally meet all of the criteria contained within these guidelines.

A separate proposal for each degree program to be converted should be submitted. If you have questions or require additional information, please contact Dr. Ralph D. Mills, State University Dean, Extended Education, at (213) 590-5691 or 8-635-5691.

These guidelines are issued in response to recommendations of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) and Supplementary 1980-81 Budget Act language of the Legislature. They have been developed to assist campuses in the conversion of self-support external degree programs as well as to assure that legislative intent and CPEC recommendations are honored.

Distribution: Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
Deans, Academic Planning
Deans, Extended/Continuing Education
Chancellor's Office Staff

AA 80-16 (BA 80-26) which promulgated the Guidelines for Reporting Procedures pertaining to State Supported Instruction in Off-Campus Locations, outlined the general recommendations of CPEC and the reporting requirements established by the supplemental budget act language.

The Legislature received the CPEC report on off-campus education, Degrees of Diversity, in March, 1980. The recommendations contained in the CPEC report were accepted by the Legislative Budget Committees. Recommendations having implications for the conversion of self-supporting campus-based external degree programs are summarized as follows:

1. In providing funding for the off-campus programs, the Governor and the Legislature should give priority to:
    a. Degree programs, in preference to courses not leading to a degree at a single locale.
    b. Upper division courses, in preference to graduate courses.
    c. Geographic areas and educational needs not presently served by accredited independent colleges and universities.
2. In The California State University and Colleges, consistent with Recommendation 1, State support for external degree programs should be limited to the following numbers of students:

1980-81	1,600 Full-Time-Equivalent Students
1981-82	2,100 Full-Time-Equivalent Students
1982-83	2,600 Full-Time-Equivalent Students

In keeping with these recommendations, campus-based self-support external baccalaureate degree programs are eligible for conversion, provided the campus does not exceed its allocated state-supported off-campus FTES (AA 80-16 and BA 80-26).

In addition to the general limitations above, conversion and operation of CSUC self-support campus-based external degree programs shall be governed by the following guidelines and understandings.

Programs proposed for conversion to General Fund Support will require the approval of the Chancellor and they must meet the following criteria:

1. Be a program leading to a baccalaureate degree offered in a single locale (Certificate and Master's degree programs will normally not be considered for conversion unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated).
2. There shall be a clear and demonstrable need for the program, such that at least one complete cycle of courses would allow completion of the degree program within a reasonable period of time.
3. The program shall be one which serves the general public rather than a closed group of corporate or agency employees or military personnel.
4. Program admission and graduation requirements as well as all other academic regulations shall be consistent with those required for on-campus programs.
5. Learning resources at the site of instruction shall be adequate to maintain program integrity and academic quality.
6. The program must meet WASC standards for off-campus instruction with regard to program coordination, academic advisement, student counseling; and other student support services.
7. Program courses shall be staffed in accordance with the accepted faculty staffing patterns of General Fund supported programs.
8. Conversion of a given program shall not result in exceeding the campus FTES allocation for off-campus instruction.
9. The program to be converted should be one that appears on the approved campus Academic Master Plan.
10. Conversion shall have no effect upon campus enrollment allocations for that budget year.

11. There shall be evidence that the financial impact on the campus General Fund resources and the Continuing Education Revenue Fund have been thoroughly evaluated.

12. The needs of students within the self-support program shall be protected; there shall be evidence of compliance with all legal requirements and good faith obligations.

Programs meeting the above criteria will not be converted to state support automatically. Proposals must include evidence that the criteria above have been met. They should be addressed to Dr. Ralph D. Mills, State University Dean, Extended Education and received at least one full term prior to the anticipated conversion date.

ACS:jcr

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802
(213) 590-5708

Robert O. Bess ✓

Code AA 79-14

Date: May 11, 1979

To: Vice Presidents of
Academic Affairs

From: Alex C. Sherriffs
Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Subject: Procedures for Handling Pilot External Degree Programs at the Conclusion of Their Pilot Periods

Attached please find the recently adopted procedures for handling self-supporting pilot external degree programs at the conclusion of their initially defined pilot period. These procedures were developed by the Commission on Extended Education and reviewed by Academic Affairs staff, the Academic Senate, appropriate campus personnel and the CCOP. They become effective during the 1978-79 academic year.

All self-supporting external degree programs, including those now currently operational which are already beyond their initial pilot period, are now subject to these procedures. I am requesting that for those programs which have already gone beyond their pilot period that the campus submit its request that the program be terminated, have its pilot period extended, or that it be converted to "regular" external degree status at your earliest convenience.

Please direct any questions regarding this matter to Dean Ralph D. Mills or Dr. Donald W. Fletcher.

ACS:pw
Attachment

Distribution: Chancellor's Office Staff
Deans of Extended/Continuing Education
Chairs, Academic Senates

Trustees California State
University and Colleges
MAY 21 1979
ACADEMIC PROJECTS

PROCEDURES FOR ACTION AT THE CONCLUSION OF EXTERNAL DEGREE PILOT PERIODS

I. Assumptions

A. Policy Authorization

Authority has been delegated to the Chancellor to approve 1) pilot external degree programs and 2) degree programs which the Trustees have endorsed in principal on the Academic Master Plan.

B. Policy Administration

Accordingly, procedures will be administrative ones, subject to approval of the Chancellor and administered by the Chancellor. The recommended procedures would be implemented by the Division of Extended Education in cooperation with the Division of Educational Programs and Resources when Academic Master Plan revision is involved.

C. Standardized Data Collection

Enrollment data, faculty data and financial data will be collected annually in a standard format for every self-support external degree program, regardless of its status. These data will be available for all evaluation activities, and will not have to be specificially requested.

D. Annual Evaluation Report

A series of annual evaluation reports which were conducted during the pilot period will be available.

E. Support of External Degree Programs

It is assumed that external degree programs will remain self-supporting until authorization is obtained for state support. The currently proposed procedures would need some modification in cases where conversion to state support is planned.

II. Procedures

Prior to the expiration of the pilot period, the Division of Extended Education will inquire about campus intent with respect to each pilot external degree program. Three alternatives are possible:

1) Termination of the program (i.e., cessation of new admissions)
2) Extension of the pilot period
3) Conversion to permanent status as an external degree program listed on the Academic Master Plan for the campus. The campus decision shall be made in accordance with established curricular review procedures

A. Termination of Pilot Programs
   1. Criteria for review and approval of campus request
      a. Protection of in-progress students
      b. Compliance with all legal requirements, commit-

c. For occupational programs, evidence of sustained employment or inservice training demand '
d. Projected changes in composition of faculty and number of faculty positions
e. Itemization of current and proposed sites (for inclusion in the Academic Master Plan)
f. Assessment of financial impact on campus Continuing Education Revenue Fund in terms of campus' capacity to sustain other self-support programs
g. Proposed evaluation schedule and explanation of any changes in evaluation procedures. It is assumed that normal campus review procedures would be followed.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BAKERSFIELD · CHICO · DOMINGUEZ HILLS · FRESNO · FULLERTON · HAYWARD · HUMBOLDT
POMONA · SACRAMENTO · SAN BERNARDINO · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO · SAN JOSE

LONG BEACH · LOS ANGELES · NORTHRIDGE
SAN LUIS OBISPO · SONOMA · STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
(213) 590-

MEMORANDUM

September 1, 1987

To: Distribution

From: Ralph D. Mills
Assistant Vice Chancellor,
Academic Affairs (Acting)

Subject: Transfer of Consortium B.S. and M.S. in Health Care Administration to CSU, Long Beach

Attached for your information and files is the endorsed Memorandum of Understanding under the terms of which responsibility for the Consortium's B.S. and M.S. Programs in Health Care Administration have been transferred to the responsibility of CSU, Long Beach.

RDM:pw:3741
Attachment

Distribution:
Dr. W. Ann Reynolds
Dr. Herbert L. Carter
Dr. Lee R. Kerschner
Dr. John M. Smart
Dr. Stephan Horn
Mr. Louis V. Messner
Dr. Anthony J. Moye
Dr. Donald W. Fletcher
Dr. Ralph Bigelow
Dr. Joan T. Cobin
Dr. Marilyn Crego
Ms. Jackie Baird
Dr. John R. Beljan
Dr. Keith I. Polakoff
Dr. Donald Lauda
Dr. Donna D. George

400 GOLDEN SHORE, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4275

INFORMATION: (213) 590-5506

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

The attached Memorandum of Understanding pertains to the transfer of The Consortium Bachelor of Science and Master of Science in Health Care Administration programs to California State University, Long Beach. The signatures affixed below signify that both parties involved in this transfer agree to all conditions and understandings contained in this document.

W Ann Reynolds

W. Ann Reynolds
Chancellor
The California State University

8/31/87
Date

John R. Beljan

John R. Beljan
Vice-President for Academic Affairs
California State University, Long Beach

8/25/87
Date

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM PROGRAM

I PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

Campus: California State University, Long Beach

Programs: Bachelor of Science, Health Care Administration; Master of Science, Health Care Administration

CSULB Office(s)/Individual(s) with Oversight Responsibility:

John R. Beljan, M.D.
Vice-President for Academic Affairs

Program Status:

Both programs have been approved for inclusion in the campus Master Plan beginning with the 1987-88 academic year. The B.S. will be internalized as a regular state-support program, effective Fall term 1987. The M.S. will continue as a self-support external degree program for the 1987-88 academic year and will be delivered by University Extension Service working in concert with the School of Applied Arts and Sciences. The campus tentatively plans to move the M.S. to a state-support basis beginning with the 1989-90 academic year, but the Extended Degree program may continue on a needs-analysis basis. B.S. ~~course~~ fees will be at the standard campus rate; M.S. course fees for the 1987-88 will not exceed ~~$150 per semester unit~~ the published Consortium fees for Fall 1986 (see addendum).

Program Delivery Area:

California State University, Long Beach is authorized to offer the B.S. and M.S. Health Care Administration programs at the following existing sites: West Los Angeles (M.S.); Long Beach (B.S. and M.S.); Pomona (M.S.); South Orange County (M.S.); and Sacramento (M.S.). (See special conditions in Section VIII.) Classes will continue to be held at locations convenient to the working adult student.

II THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

California State University, Long Beach agrees to operate the M.S. program as a self-support external degree. The campus agrees to follow those appropriate WASC guidelines which pertain to off-campus instruction and to operate this program in accordance with the "Policies and Procedures for the Preparation of Proposals and Administration of External Degree Programs" (1978).

California State University, Long Beach tentatively agrees to accept the curriculum of The Consortium program without substantive change subject to approval by the CSULB offices of Academic Affairs, and Admission and Records. Major curricular changes which occur following transfer of this external degree shall be filed with the Office of Extended Education, Office of the Chancellor.

III STUDENT STATUS

Active Consortium Students:

Consortium students Active as of September 1, 1987 who choose to continue their external degree program with California State University, Long Beach by registering their intent with University Extension Services by October 1, 1987 will not be required to apply for admission to the Extended Degree program at CSULB.

Election of regulations for degree requirements ("Catalog rights") for the Health Care Administration programs are based on the 1985-87 Consortium catalog, and include all academic policy and curriculum changes which have been officially instituted after the student's admission to The Consortium. These students will be permitted to retain catalog rights from the date of their admission to The Consortium, and will not be held to any program changes instituted by the campus. Active Student Status is defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog. This will also include Active students who hold Conditional Admission status defined by The Consortium as "A student may be conditionally admitted if evidence shows the student has sufficient academic, professional and/or other potential relative to the degree objectives."

While original catalog rights will be guaranteed, students may elect to instead meet CSULB degree requirements, if approved by appropriate campus authorities.

The student's Consortium Program of Study will serve as a listing of Consortium degree requirements (see form attached). Documentation of completion of these requirements shall be verified by the appropriate Consortium officer before these records are submitted to CSULB. All students completing graduation requirements after September 1, 1987 will receive the CSULB degree.

The seven-year regulation on completion of the M.S. degree applies from the date of admission to The Consortium.

Inactive Consortium Students:

Consortium students who do not qualify for Active status on September 1, 1987 are defined by The Consortium to mean students who do not enroll in a Consortium course, complete an approved assessment examination, or enroll in a course at another institution during a calendar year. Such students who wish to re-enter the M.S. program after the program has been accepted by the campus, will be required to apply for admission to the program through University Extension Services, CSULB, and meet the application procedures and admission requirements for the degree as defined by CSULB at the time of their admission.

Inquiries and Applications:

Inquiries and applications for admission to The Consortium Health Care Administration programs which are received on or after July 1 will not be processed by The Consortium. Such applications and inquiries will be forwarded immediately, in the case of the M.S. program, to University Extension Services and in the case of the B.S. program to the Admissions office of California State University, Long Beach in order that appropriate measures can be taken to facilitate admission in Fall, 1987.

IV STUDENT RECORDS

Records on all Consortium Active and Inactive Health Care Administration M.S. students will be transferred to University Extension Services, CSU Long Beach, by September 1, 1987, or as soon thereafter as 1987 summer grades have been posted. Instructor grade sheets for student currently enrolled in The Consortium M.S. classes will be sent to University Extension Services within 3 days of the end of class. Records to be forwarded will include all relevant back-up materials such as final Grade Rosters and fee payment information and all records currently in the possession of Consortium MHCA personnel including the present Regional Program Director. The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will oversee the transfer in cooperation with University Extension Services which will subsequently coordinate with CSULB Admissions and Records. Student records on graduates of the program will also be transferred to CSULB by September 1, 1987, or as soon thereafter as 1987 summer grades have been posted.

V TRANSITION PROCESS

Transfer activities will be conducted by Consortium and CSU, Long Beach personnel, Dr. Donna George, Dean of University Extension Services and Dr. Don Lauda, Dean of Applied Arts and Sciences, during the period from the date of this Memorandum to August 31, 1987. Final program transfer will be effective September 1, 1987 (Fall term, 1987).

All program management becomes the sole responsibility of California State University, Long Beach, if the requirements of this document have been met. (See Conditions in Section VIII.)

The Consortium central office will be responsible for finalizing all summer term course activity including posting of grades to the permanent record cards, sending grades to students, and paying instructors. Any grade changes (including completion of "I" grades) occurring after September 1, 1987 will be the responsibility of CSULB. Graduation Applications received prior to August 31, 1987 will be processed by The Consortium and the Graduation Fee retained by The Consortium to cover evaluation costs. Applications received thereafter will be forwarded immediately to CSULB and must be in conformance with CSULB policies.

VI STUDENT NOTIFICATION

Active and Inactive students will be notified of the transfer of the M.S. Health Care Administration programs to the California State University, Long Beach campus by joint letter signed by the Director of The Consortium and the Dean of University Extension Services. The letter will provide information per relevant sections of this Memorandum, particularly regarding the student's status in the program (Section III). The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will be responsible for distribution of the letters no later than August 31, 1987. An additional copy of the mailing list or labels will be provided to University Extension Services so that fall class information can be made available to students.

VII THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS ARE DESIGNATED AS THE APPROPRIATE CONTACTS DURING THE TRANSITION PROCESS:

The Consortium	California State University, Long Beach
Joan Cobin, Director The Consortium	Donna George, Dean University Extension Services
	Donald Lauda, Dean School of Applied Arts and Sciences

VIII ADDITIONAL ISSUES AND CONDITIONS

When student records, faculty information and other pertinent data regarding the Sacramento program delivery situation have been provided to University Extension Services, a mutually acceptable budget will be created for managing the Sacramento site(s) to support current active enrollment through completion of the program, not exceeding two years. It is agreed that any mutually acceptable deficits which may occur in discharging this responsibility will be underwritten by the Chancellor's Office in the form of annual remittances to the CSULB Campus CERF account. In the unlikely event of a deficit dispute, the Commission on Extended Education shall serve as arbiter.

To maintain the quality and continuity of the M.S. in Health Care Administration program as established by The Consortium, it is desirable that the following data be provided to University Extension Sevices on, and preferably before, September 1, 1987:

A. A summary of the surveys and needs assessments which led to the creation of the program;

B. A statement describing availability of adequate learning resources, and the amount and extent of current integration of instructional technology in the presentation of course content;

C. Current (1986-87) roster of instructors accompanied by vitae and designation of their tenure and rank at appropriate CSU campuses;

D. A roster of the current advisory committee and agendas/minutes of the last two meetings;

E. The name, address and position of the current outside program evaluator along with copies of the last two evaluations;

F. The written policy on grading standards currently in effect;

G. The current job description for site coordination and the last completed annual expense ledger so that a baseline of coordination activity and expense can be determined;

H. The list of instructional sites which are currently in use or obligated for the remainder of 1987, and any other which have been used in the past two years of the program;

I. All past budgets providing accurate expense and income information which can be correlated with course offerings and student enrollments.

IPDC#1 A-10MEMO
Revised 6-29-87

ADDENDUM, PAGE 1

Attachment C

Consortium Fee Schedule
Effective for Fall 1986 Term

			% Increase
1.	Admission Application	$ 45	0%
2.	Catalog (first copy is complementary to Consortium students/applicants)	$ 5	0%
3.	Course Fee (all programs)	$150	11%
4.	Graduation Application for Degree or Certificate (includes Diploma)	$ 35	0%
5.	Late Registration Fee	$35 per course	0%
6.	Masters Degree Comprehensive Exam Fee	$480	0%
7.	Nursing Program Fee - Payable upon formal admission to The Consortium Nursing Program	$250	0%
8.	Nursing Program Fee Deferment (for full explanation refer to page 36 of the Nursing section of this schedule)	$ 40	0%
9.	Returned Check Fee/Invalid Bank Card Fee	$ 10	0%
10.	Special Studies Fee (Independent Study, Masters Degree Project/Thesis, Tutorials		
	Undergraduates	$165 per unit	10%
	Graduates	$165 per unit	0%
11.	Transcript	$ 5 per copy	0%
12.	Workshops	$ 45 per workshop	0%
13.	Service Charge for Visa/Mastercharge	$ 3 per transaction	100%
14.	Active Student Status	$ 20 per student	100%
15.	Designated Teacher Credential Fee	$ 45 per unit	50%
16.	Writing Proficiency Exam	$ 40 per exam	60%
17.	American Government Exam	$ 35 per exam	0%

University Extension Services
California State University, Long Beach

Health Care Administration—Fall 1987 Schedule

HCA 505 Organization and Systems of Health Care (3 units)				
Sequence Number 8261	September 1-December 8	Posner	T 7-10 pm	CSU Sac
Sequence Number 8227	September 8-December 16	Riedel	W 7-10 pm	CSULB
Sequence Number 8228	September 14-December 14	Dowd	M 6:30-9:30 pm	PVCH
HCA 515 Advanced Financial Management in Health Care (3 units)				
Sequence Number 8229	September 1-December 15	Capelle	T 7-10 pm	CSULB
Sequence Number 8262	September 3-December 10	Peterson	Th 7-10 pm	CSU Sac
HCA 524 Advanced Legal Aspects of Health Administration (3 units)				
Sequence Number 8230	September 15-December 15	Price	T 6:30-9:30 pm	CHLA
HCA 530 Strategic Planning and Marketing in Health Care (3 units)				
Sequence Number 8263	September 2-December 9	Voelm	W 6-9 pm	CSU Sac
HCA 535 Quantitative Methods for Health Administration (3 units)				
Sequence Number 8231	September 3-December 17	Dowd	Th 7-10 pm	CSULB
Sequence Number 8232	September 9-December 16	Dowd	W 5:30-8:30 pm	SCH
HCA 599.S Directed Study (1-3 units)				
Sequence Number 8264 (1) 8265 (2) 8266 (3)	August 21-Arranged	Van Gigch	F 7-9 pm	CSU Sac
Sequence Number 8240 (1) 8241 (2) 8242 (3)	September 1-December 15	Tumelty	T 6-8pm	CSULB
Sequence Number 8233 (1) 8234 (2) 8235 (3)	September 8-December 15	Dowd	T 4:30-6:30 pm	CHLA
Sequence Number 8236 (1) 8237 (2) 8238 (3)	September 9-December 16	Dowd	W 3:30-5:30 pm	SCH
Sequence Number 8270 (1) 8269 (2) 8239 (3)	September 14-December 14	Dowd	M 4:30-6:30 pm	PVCH
HCA 685.S Residency (3 units)				
Sequence Number 8267	August 21-Arranged	Van Gigch	F 7-9 pm	CSU Sac
Sequence Number 8243	September 1-December 15	Tumelty	T 6-8 pm	CSULB
Sequence Number 8255	September 14-Arranged	Dowd	M 4:30-6:30 pm	PVCH
HCA 690.S Project (3 units)				
Sequence Number 8268	August 21-Arranged	Slater	F 7-9 pm	CSU Sac
Sequence Number 8258	September 1-December 15	Hubbard	T 6-8 pm	CSULB
Sequence Number 8256	September 14-Arranged	Dowd	M 4:30-6:30 pm	PVCH
GS 700 Project Continuation				
Sequence Number 8260				

Key:

CHLA	Children's Hospital of Los Angeles
CSULB	California State University, Long Beach
CSUSac	California State University, Sacramento
PVCH	Pomona Valley Community Hospital
SCH	Saddleback Community Hospital

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Health Care Administration — Fall 1987

Orientation Meetings and Registration

CHLA
Children's Hospital of Los Angeles
4650 Sunset Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Tuesday, September 8, 1987; 4:30-6:30 pm
Conference Room D

CSULB
California State University, Long Beach
1250 Bellflower Blvd.
Long Beach, CA 90840
Tuesday, September 1, 1987; 6-8 pm
Bldg. SPA, room 124

CSU Sac
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95819
Call (916) 923-0022 for room number

PVCH
Pomona Valley Community Hospital
1798 Garey Avenue
Pomona, CA 91767
Monday, September 14, 1987; 4:30-6:30 pm
Room 2

SCH
Saddleback Community Hospital
Medical Office Building, Suite 3
24451 Health Center Drive
Laguna Hills, CA 92653
Wednesday, September 9, 1987; 3:30-5:30 pm
Auditorium A

Fees:
Course fee per unit is $150.
Special studies fee per unit is $165
(project, thesis, tutorials)

For further information:
Steve Mirenda
Program Administrator
University Extension Services
CSULB
1250 Bellflower Blvd., SSA/133
Long Beach, CA 90840
(213) 498-5561 or (714) 840-0010

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE CONSORTIUM OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
6300 STATE UNIVERSITY DRIVE, LONG BEACH, CA 90815
(213) 498-4119 or 1-800-352-7517 (toll free for California residents only)

B.S. — HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION
Program of Study

Name ______________________________ (Last) ______________________________ (First) ______________________________ (Middle)

Address ______________________________ (Street) ______________________________ (City) ______________________________ (Zip)

Soc. Sec. No. _____-_____-_____ Telephone: Home (_____) (Area Code) __________ (Number) Bus. (_____) (Area Code) __________ (Number)

Campus location: ______________________________ Proposed date of graduation: ______________________________

Requirements for the degree: Minimum 124 semester units with 2.0 (C) G.P.A. including:

a. Core courses in major, 45 semester units, and prerequisites, 18 semester units;
b. General Education and Statutory Requirements in U.S. History, U.S. Constitution, and Principles of California State and Local Government, 48 semester units of which 9 are upper division and in residence with with CSU system;
c. Upper division core, 45 semester units;
d. 30 semester units in residence with The Consortium;
e. Completion of writing skills requirement;
f. Formal approval by the Academic Program Committee in Health Care Administration and Advisory Committee.

I. Transfer units allowed: ______________________________

NOTE: If transfer courses are to be used to meet any requirement(s), please indicate by listing school of transfer, course department and number. (Official transcripts must be on file in the Admissions and Records Office.)

II. General Education units needed: __________ of which __________ units need to be upper division in residence.

Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade	Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade

III. Prerequisite Courses (18 units): Accounting Fund., Intro. to Economics, Elem. Statistics, Intro. to Psychology, Intro. to Sociology, Intro. to Data Processing (to include BASIC programming language).

Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade	Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade

IV. Core Courses (45 units Upper Division):

A. Administration and Management (15 units):

Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade	Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade
HCA 410 INTRO HLTH MGT CR	3		HCA 416 MGT INFO SYSTEMS	3	
HCA 412 HLTH PERS MGT	3				
HCA 414 LDRSHP DEVL HLTH	3				

B. Organization and Delivery (12 units):

Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade	Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade
HCA 420 INTRO HLTH CARE	3		HCA 424 LEGAL ASPTS HCA	3	
HCA 422 PROBS ISSUES HCA	3		HCA 426 QUAL ASSUR HCA	3	

C. Financial Management (6 units):

Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade	Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade
HCA 440 FIN ANAL HCA	3		HCA 442 BUDGET HCA	3	

D. Planning and Quantitative (6 units):

Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade	Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade
HCA 450 HEALTH PLANNING	3		HCA 452 PROGRAM EVAL	3	

E. Social and Behavioral (6 units):

Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade	Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade
HCA 454 MED SOCIOLOGY	3		HCA 456 ELECT SOC BEH SCI	3	

F. Integrative Seminar (3 units)

HCA 495 Integrative Sem	3	

V. Graduation: Apply for graduation at least 6 months prior to your proposed date of graduation.
FALL TERM BY JUNE 1, SPRING TERM BY NOVEMBER 1, SS TERM BY MARCH 15

VI. Signatures:

Student ______________________________ Date: __________

Program Director ______________________________ Date: __________

NOTE: This form should be completed during the first semester after the student has been admitted to the program. After signing, distribute as follows:

Original	(White)	Student
Duplicate	(Yellow)	Admissions and Records
Triplicate	(Pink)	Program Director

THE CONSORTIUM OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
6300 STATE UNIVERSITY DRIVE, LONG BEACH, CA 90815
(213) 498-4119 or 1-800-352-7517 (toll free for California residents only)

M.S. — HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION
Program of Study

Name ______________________________ (Last) ______________________________ (First) ______________________________ (Middle)

Address ______________________________ (Street) ______________________________ (City) ______________________________ (Zip)

Soc. Sec. No. _____-____-______ Telephone: Home (_____) (Area Code) __________ (Number) Bus. (_____) (Area Code) __________ (Number)

Graduate of ______________________________ Degree/Major ______________________________

Campus location: ______________________________ Proposed date of graduation: ______________________________

Requirements for the degree: Minimum 30 semester units with 3.0 (B) G.P.A. including:

- a. Core courses in major, 30 semester units, and prerequisites;
- b. Minimum of 21 semester units in residence with The Consortium;
- c. Completion of graduate writing proficiency requirement;
- d. Formal approval by the Academic Program Committee in Health Care Administration and Advisory Committee.

I. Courses Required in Preparation for the Major:

Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade	Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade
Accounting			Financial Management		
Economics					
Information Systems					
Statistics					
Health Care Systems					

II. Core Courses (30 units):

Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade	Course Dept. and No.	Units	Grade
HCA 500 ADM BEHAV LDRSHP	3		HCA 635 QUANT METHODS HCA	3	
HCA 505 ORG SYSTMS HCA	3		HCA 685 RESIDENCY	3	
HCA 510 HUMAN RES MGT	3		HCA 690 DIR FLD PROJ	3	
HCA 515 ADV FIN MGT HCA	3		HCA 695 CRIT ANL HCA	3	
HCA 524 ADV LEGAL HCA	3				
HCA 530 STRAT PLAN MKT	3				

NOTE: If transfer courses have been approved to meet any requirement(s), please indicate by listing school of transfer, course department and number. (Official transcripts must be on file in the Admissions and Records Office.)

III. Admission to Classified Standing: ______________________________

IV. Graduation: Apply for graduation at least 6 months prior to your proposed date of graduation.
FALL TERM BY JUNE 1, SPRING TERM BY NOVEMBER 1, SS TERM BY MARCH 15

V. Signatures:

Student ______________________________ Date: __________

Program Director ______________________________ Date: __________

NOTE: This form should be completed during the first semester after the student has been admitted to the program. After signing, distribute as follows:

Original	(White)	Student
Duplicate	(Yellow)	Admissions and Records
Triplicate	(Pink)	Program Director

A/R 5/87

Attachment 2

Projected Budget for Consortium BS BA at Santa Barbara Site

Revenue

Minimum @ $150/SCH
based on 5 three unit courses during 1987/88 with an enrollment of 20 students.
5 X 3 X 20 X 150 = 300 SCH   45,000

Maximum @ $150/SCH
based on 6 three unit courses during 1987/88 with an enrollment of 35 students.
6 X 3 X 35 X 150 = 630 SCH   94,500

Minimum @ $100/SCH
based on 5 three unit courses during 1987/88 with an enrollment of 20 students.
5 X 3 X 20 X 100 = 300 SCH   30,000

Maximum @ $100/SCH
based on 6 three unit courses during 1987/88 with an enrollment of 35 students.
6 X 3 X 35 X 100 = 630 SCH   63,000

Expenditures

	5 Courses	6 Courses
Coordinator	10,000	10,000
Instructors 2,460/course =	12,300	14,760
Admissions & Records @ 20/SCH	6,000	12,600
	28,000	37,360

Campus Overhead (accrued by number of courses offered by each)

@ $150	17,000	57,140
@ $100	2,000	25,640

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BAKERSFIELD · CHICO · DOMINGUEZ HILLS · FRESNO · FULLERTON · HAYWARD · HUMBOLDT
POMONA · SACRAMENTO · SAN BERNARDINO · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO · SAN JOSE

LONG BEACH · LOS ANGELES · NORTHRIDGE
SAN LUIS OBISPO · SONOMA · STANISLAUS

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
(213) 590-

MEMORANDUM

July 10, 1987

To: Distribution

From: Ralph D. Mills Ralph D Mills
Assistant Vice Chancellor,
Academic Affairs (Acting)

Subject: Endorsed M.O.U. for Statewide Nursing Program

Attached for your information and files is the endorsed Memorandum of Understanding under the terms of which responsibility for the Statewide Nursing Program has been transferred to the administrative responsibility of California State University, Dominguez Hills.

Please accept my personal thanks for the time and energy each of you has invested in the preparation of this document. It has required a remarkable and extraordinary effort on the part of Dominguez Hills administrators and faculty, as well as the staff of The Consortium.

RDM:pw:3643

Distribution:
- Dr. W. Ann Reynolds
- Dr. Herbert L. Carter
- Mr. D. Dale Hanner
- Dr. John M. Smart
- Dr. John A. Brownell
- Mr. Louis V. Messner
- Dr. Anthony J. Moye
- Dr. Donald W. Fletcher
- Dr. Ralph Bigelow
- Dr. Joan T. Cobin
- Dr. Judith Lewis
- Dr. Marilyn Crego
- Ms. Jackie Baird
- Dr. James G. Harris
- Dr. Gary Levine
- Dr. Dennis Fusi
- Dr. Robert Dowling

400 GOLDEN SHORE, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4275

INFORMATION: (213) 590-5506

7/6/87 Copy to VC, Academic Affairs
and R. Mills

California State University
Dominguez Hills

Office of the President • Carson, CA 90747 • (213) 516-3301

June 22, 1987

Dr. W. Ann Reynolds
Chancellor
The California State University
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90807

Dear Chancellor Reynolds:

I am pleased to submit for your consideration a proposed Memorandum of Understanding outlining the conditions under which California State University, Dominguez Hills would be prepared to assume responsibility for the existing Consortium system-wide Bachelor of Science and Master of Science in Nursing degree programs. We have developed this document with careful attention to the guidelines offered by the Academic Senate, CSU, relative to the transfer of Consortium programs (AS-1697-86/CAC) and in close consultation with staff from your office, The Consortium, and the Statewide Nursing Program itself. Our discussions on campus have been extensive and intensive. We have consulted with faculty members in related program areas and included them on a special faculty-administrative task group which has been at work since May 19. On June 16, our campus Academic Senate reviewed the proposed Memorandum of Understanding and endorsed efforts to secure the transfer of these programs to California State University, Dominguez Hills.

All of us who have worked to produce the enclosed proposal are keenly aware that if it is accepted, we would be embarking on an effort that is unique in the history and experience of California higher education, and one that has significant implications for realizing the special mission of The California State University to meet the needs of non-traditional adult learners. Accordingly, I can assure you of our commitment to proceed seriously and conscientiously to realize the full potential of this exciting opportunity and to ensure the success of our efforts. To this end, we are appreciative of the understanding demonstrated by all members of the CSU family with whom we have so far dealt of the importance of approaching this transfer in a flexible, open-minded manner.

As you will note in reviewing the enclosure, there are many issues to be resolved before the Statewide Nursing Program can transition to campus-based, State-support status. We have identified numerous policy and operational areas where we cannot expect to start out with fully developed approaches. New policies and procedures will need to be evolved through experience, consultation, and exercise of considerable judgment in order to maintain the non-traditional, flexible character of SNP in its new environment. I am especially mindful that our success in achieving this will significantly influence the system's future development of campus-based non-traditional programs, whether at the regional or statewide levels.

If it is your determination that the Dominguez Hills campus is the appropriate home for the Statewide Nursing Program, it would be my intention immediately to assign members of my staff to undertake planning for the transition in close cooperation with your designees. In particular, I would want to clarify very quickly any questions about the Nursing Program's regional and national professional accreditation after transfer. Such clarification is crucial to the protection of the interests of students already in the programs as well as those who will be admitted when the location changes.

Second, we would need to begin very quickly to develop the report on the future of SNP called for in the 1987-88 Budget Act, and which would need to be submitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by October 15. Preparation of this report provides, I believe, the logical forum for studying and resolving in the most timely manner the many issues related to funding and operation of SNP in a state-support mode.

I look forward to your positive response. I will be attending two different meetings June 22-26 and June 29-30. In my absence, Vice President for Academic Affairs James Harris will be acting for me, and will be prepared to see that you are provided any additional information which might be required to facilitate your determination on this matter.

Sincerely,

John a Brownell

John A. Brownell
Acting President

cc: Dr. William E. Vandament
Dr. Ralph D. Mills
Dr. James G. Harris
Dr. Robert Dowling

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

TRANSFER OF CONSORTIUM BS AND MS PROGRAMS IN NURSING

CAMPUS: CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS
PROGRAMS: BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN NURSING
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN NURSING

This memorandum of understanding provides the basis for cooperating in an innovative educational undertaking between California State University, Dominguez Hills (CSUDH), and the Office of the Chancellor, CSU (O/C), namely to transition the existing Consortium self-support statewide Bachelor of Science and Master of Science programs in Nursing to fully integrated campus-based State-support statewide programs under the auspices of CSUDH and to maintain their non-traditional and flexible approaches during and after the transition.

The parties begin this task with a mutual understanding of the need for and commitment to a positive outcome. Beyond being in the best interests of the CSU, CSUDH, and faculty and staff of the Statewide Nursing Program (SNP), the success of this process is an absolute necessity in order to be able to continue to serve the educational needs of the 3500 students currently enrolled in the programs and to maintain and expand access for others in the nursing profession not yet being served by SNP.

We further recognize that this effort constitutes a first for higher education in California, and perhaps nationally, and thus will require the best cooperative efforts and flexibility of all involved. Accordingly, we are prepared as the process develops to seek creative approaches to the policy and procedural barriers that will inevitably arise, and to focus on the importance of achieving a positive, mutually acceptable outcome.

Effective July 1, 1987, CSU, Dominguez Hills accepts responsibility for operating on a statewide basis the existing Consortium Bachelor of Science and Master of Science programs and staff in Nursing, and for maintaining and fostering the "non-traditional" dimensions of these programs. CSUDH agrees to operate SNP consistent with appropriate guidelines of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and in accordance with applicable sections of the "Policies and Procedures for the Preparation of Proposals and Administration of External Degree Programs" (1978), subject to the following understandings:

1. The Office of the Chancellor and CSU, Dominguez Hills recognize and accept that transitioning heretofore self-support "non-traditional" statewide programs to fully-integrated state-support campus-based statewide status will result in the identification of many areas where program policy or practice are in conflict with either campus or system policy.

    a) CSUDH and O/C agree to consider fiscal 1987-88, and if need be 1988-89, as a transition period for the SNP during which time O/C shall make every effort to secure appropriate state General Fund support for SNP which funding shall be incorporated in the regular CSUDH State-support budget for 1988-89, or, if need be, 1989-90.

    b) O/C will include the BS and MS programs in Nursing on the CSUDH Academic Master Plan submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval in January 1988. These programs will be shown as scheduled for implementation in the 1988-89 academic year as regular state-support programs.

    c) CSUDH and O/C will engage in a joint effort to study, identify and successfully resolve the policy and practical impediments to a smooth transition for SNP from its current status to its contemplated status as a campus-based state-supported non-traditional statewide educational program. Among the areas to be studied are:

        student fees; academic calendar; course classification; workload measurement; budget management and fiscal flexibility; implications of various bargaining contracts; admissions standards; library access; unique service area relationships; faculty personnel issues; curriculum review and development; space utilization; direct and indirect support staff requirements; unique operating expense requirements; logistical support services such as the Statewide Technical Bookstore; participation in commencement ceremonies; issuance of student identification cards; establishment of census dates; financial aid eligibility; options for enrollment in other than Nursing courses required for the BSN.

This review shall be completed prior to the submission of any report CSU is required by the 1987-88 Budget Act to submit concerning the status of SNP. The foregoing list is not exhaustive of the policy and practical issues which may possibly be identified, studied, and resolved during the transition period.
CSUDH and O/C will jointly prepare, review and approve the required document. O/C will apprise CSUDH of all discussions with review and fiscal control agencies regarding the status of SNP.

d) O/C agrees to propose such Title 5 changes and to issue such Executive Orders and other regulations as may be necessary to maintain the statewide non-traditional dimension of SNP under conditions of campus-based, state- or self-support, and which are necessary to promote its smooth and effective operation by CSUDH. CSUDH and O/C understand and agree that the foregoing includes the possibility of modifications of formulae in the CSU Budget Formulas and Standards Manual.

e) Staff from CSUDH and O/C will jointly review SNP fiscal and enrollment status each month during the transition period.

f) CSUDH will inform O/C of any major changes made in SNP during the transition period.

g) O/C will include at least 655 State-support FTES for the statewide BS and MS programs in Nursing in its 1988-89 enrollment projections for CSUDH. In the event efforts to secure external clearances for inclusion of these FTES in the 1988-89 state-support budget are not successful, and CSUDH agrees to maintain SNP for a subsequent year as a self-support program, O/C will repeat these efforts in connection with the 1989-90 state-support budget.

2. a) During 1987-88 and 1988-89, O/C agrees that CSUDH and SNP will continue to have at no charge access to the advice, counsel, and limited services of former Consortium employees who continue to be employed by the CSU. In particular, this refers to former Consortium staff now associated with the Innovative Program Development Center, and to the former fiscal officer who has retreated to the Chancellor's staff.

b) Responsibility for updating and arranging for publication of SNP curriculum materials shall continue to reside with SNP; instructional development and other related services should be secured through the Innovative Program Development Center. For the present, costs for curriculum updating activities will continue to be borne out of revenues generated by the sale of these materials.

c) During the agreed-upon transition period, O/C will continue to maintain the existing computer resource support levels it provides for SNP and The Consortium Admissions and Records Office. CSUDH will include consideration of administrative computing needs of SNP in its plans for development of an automated integrated student records management system (EDEN). O/C agrees that CSUDH may utilize computing maintenance resources to respond to immediate needs created by assumption of responsibility for SNP. CSUDH will evaluate the impact of transferring SNP to CSUDH on existing campus computing resources and request such adjustments as may be warranted in the 1989-90 regular support budget.

3. a) During the transition year, SNP shall report to the Vice President, Academic Affairs, CSUDH, and the Director of SNP will be invited to meet with various campus councils and committees. SNP will be invited to send a representative to the Academic Senate, CSUDH.

b) All long-term organizational arrangements, including the appropriate school status, and policy determinations will be made in a collegial manner, and will include at a minimum consultation with the Academic Senate, CSUDH, and the faculty and administrative staff of SNP.

c) CSUDH and O/C agree that all employees of The Consortium and SNP who transfer to CSUDH under the terms of this agreement shall become employees of CSUDH and shall receive rights and benefits accorded regular CSUDH employees. CSUDH agrees to accept all accrued vacation, sick leave, and compensating time off of transferring employees.

d) O/C will pay the costs of relocation of SNP from its current location at CSU, Long Beach to its CSU, Dominguez Hills location.

e) O/C and CSUDH recognize and agree that the spirit of cooperation underlying this Memorandum of Understanding calls for reasonable interpretations on the part of both parties with respect to precise effective dates cited variously herein. In particular, actual times for complete transfers of personnel, budgetary authority, student and administrative records, equipment and files, etc., may need to be negotiated early in the transition period. CSUDH agrees that former Consortium records staff transferred to CSUDH with SNP may need to assist in activities related to phase out and transfer of Consortium instructional programs other than SNP.

4. a) During 1987-88, or until such time as state-support is achieved and while SNP remains a part of the CSUDH curriculum, SNP student fee-generated funds and revenues shall be transferred to and held in separate CERF accounts established under the jurisdiction of CSUDH.

b) During the period of transition, SNP shall continue to operate according to its existing fiscal procedures, subject to the general supervision of the CSUDH Business Office. Prior to achievement of State support, CSUDH and SNP shall jointly determine appropriate procedures for fiscal operations in the context of requirements of the General Fund, CSUDH fiscal policies and procedures, and the need to maintain the statewide and non-traditional nature of SNP.

c) O/C will maintain a reserve fund of $300,000 in each of fiscal years of 1987-88 and 1988-89 to be applied against any operating deficits which may occur in SNP during its transition from Consortium to CSUDH auspices. To access this reserve fund, CSUDH must prepare a request to O/C to allocate funds to cover an identified deficit. Such request must be accompanied by appropriate justification and identification of need.

d) SNP will provide CSUDH with a listing of accounts and revenues currently held in either the CSU Foundation or in auxiliary organizations at CSU, Long Beach or elsewhere. All such accounts and revenues will be transferred to the CSUDH Foundation, except that with the agreement of CSUDH, revenues generated through the Statewide Technical Bookstore may continue to be held in the appropriate current accounts at the CSU Foundation.

e) SNP will be transferred to CSUDH free of any debts or other fiscal encumbrances.

f) At such time as State-support for SNP is achieved, any surpluses remaining in its CERF accounts after all program obligations are satisfied shall remain with CSUDH for utilization in connection with SNP continuing education developmental activities.

5. a) CSUDH and O/C agree that SNP is a statewide program administered by CSU, Dominguez Hills, and that the service area for this program is the State of California. As such, decisions to expand or contract program size, including establishment or termination of regions and sites where need is identified, are vested in the President of CSUDH. Such decisions shall be made in consultation with the Chancellor. O/C and CSUDH shall jointly establish mechanisms for reviewing the implementation of such decisions.

b) O/C and CSUDH shall jointly examine the nature of and responsibilities inherent in participation by other CSU campuses in SNP as cooperating campuses. The Chancellor will provide necessary assistance in maintaining and/or securing cooperation by CSU campuses to provide for the uninterrupted operation of SNP during and after the period of transition.

6. a) CSUDH and O/C will work cooperatively and take those steps which may be necessary to ensure that the regional and national professional accreditation (by WASC and the National League of Nursing respectively) of SNP are maintained throughout and following the transition period.

b) Subject to approval by WASC and NLN, students in continuing status in SNP when the transition period commences will receive Consortium degrees upon completion of requirements for the BSN or MSN Programs. Similarly, students admitted to conditional or regular status on July 1, 1987, or thereafter will be granted degrees by CSUDH.

c) Consortium students Active as of July 1, 1987 who choose to continue their degree program with CSUDH will not be required to apply for admission to CSUDH. These students will be permitted to retain catalog rights from the date of their admission to The Consortium, and will not be held to any program changes instituted by the campus. This will include Active students who hold Conditional Admission status. Active Student Status is defined in the 1985-87 Consortium catalog. Catalog rights for the Nursing program are defined in the 1985-

87 Consortium catalog, and additionally include all academic policy and curriculum changes which have been officially instituted after the student's admission to The Consortium. While original catalog rights will be guaranteed, students may elect to instead meet CSUDH degree requirements, if approved by appropriate campus authorities.

d) The student's Program of Study will serve as documentation of degree requirements.

e) Consortium students who do not qualify for Active status on July 1, 1987 but who wish to enter the campus Nursing program will be required to apply for admission to CSUDH and to meet the requirements for the degree as defined by CSUDH at the time of their admission.

f) Records on all Active and Inactive Nursing students from The Consortium will be transferred to CSUDH, by September 1, 1987 or as soon thereafter as grades are posted. This will include all relevant back-up material such as Final Grade Rosters and fee payment information. The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will oversee the transfer in cooperation with the CSUDH designated office.

g) All program management becomes the sole responsibility of CSUDH on July 1, 1987. Prior to that date, Consortium personnel will work with designated campus personnel in preparation for the transition.
Graduation Applications received prior to July 1, 1987 will be processed by The Consortium and the Graduation Fee will be retained by The Consortium to cover evaluation costs. Applications received thereafter will be forwarded to CSUDH for action.

h) Active and Inactive students will be notified of the transfer of the Nursing program to the CSUDH campus by joint letter signed by the Director of The Consortium and the Vice President, Academic Affairs, CSUDH. The letter will provide information per relevant sections of the Memorandum, particularly regarding the student's status in the program. The Consortium Office of Admissions and Records will be responsible for distribution of the letters.

7. a) CSUDH and O/C shall establish mechanisms for ongoing review of implementation of all aspects of this memorandum of understanding. Should O/C not succeed in securing acceptable state-support funding for SNP,

CSUDH reserves the option of maintaining the program on a self-support basis. CSUDH is the sole judge on matters of academic program viability for purposes of this Memorandum of Understanding.

b) Before May, 1988, CSUDH and O/C shall jointly review the status of transition efforts and efforts to achieve State General Fund support for SNP. The President of CSUDH will inform the Chancellor, CSU, of his determination regarding continuation of the program at CSUDH during the 1988-89 academic year based on the results of that review. A similar review and determination regarding subsequent status of SNP will be made before or during May 1989, if the program is to be continued by CSUDH during the 1989-90 academic year.

W Ann Reynolds

W. ANN REYNOLDS
CHANCELLOR
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

July 2, 1987
DATE

John A. Brownell

JOHN A. BROWNELL
ACTING PRESIDENT
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
DOMINGUEZ HILLS

July 2, 1987
DATE

APPENDIX C

CONSORTIUM DATA BY ACADEMIC YEARS: 1982-87

APPENDIX C
Page 1 of 2 Pages

CONSORTIUM DATA BY ACADEMIC YEARS: 1982-87

1986-87 data is not complete as Summer 1987 term figures are not yet finalized.

HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT

Program	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87
BS, Business Admin.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	34
MA, Environ. Plan.	N/A	74	73	34	32
BS, Health Care Admin.	N/A	63	54	52	32
MS, Health Care Admin.	N/A	110	174	187	151
BS, Hotel & Rest. Admin.	N/A	N/A	14	N/A	N/A
BS, Nursing	N/A	1,761	2,685	2,900	2,053
MS, Nursing	N/A	N/A	67	338	255
Master Public Admin.	N/A	137	129	180	200
MS, Quality Assurance	N/A	N/A	N/A	57	87
BS, Vocational Ed.	N/A	85	83	36	30
MA, Vocational Ed.	N/A	38	34	28	15
TOTALS	N/A	2,268	3,313	3,812	2,889

FTES

Program	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87
BS, Business Admin.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13
MA, Environ. Plan.	N/A	12	13	6	4
BS, Health Care Admin.	N/A	12	11	11	10
MS, Health Care Admin.	N/A	23	34	37	35
BS, Hotel & Rest. Admin.	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	N/A
BS, Nursing	N/A	444	546	620	473
MS, Nursing	N/A	N/A	9	43	66
Master Public Admin.	N/A	24	27	36	49
MS, Quality Assurance	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	25
BS, Vocational Ed.	N/A	10	19	8	6
MA, Vocational Ed.	N/A	15	10	9	4
TOTALS	398	540	671	782	684

STUDENT CREDIT UNITS

Program	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87
BS, Business Admin.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	390
MA, Environ. Plan.	N/A	348	382	182	120
BS, Health Care Admin.	N/A	365	336	339	303
MS, Health Care Admin.	N/A	704	1,029	1,120	1,029
BS, Hotel & Rest. Admin.	N/A	N/A	54	N/A	N/A
BS, Nursing	N/A	13,321	16,389	18,598	14,175
MS, Nursing	N/A	N/A	264	1,289	1,970
Master Public Admin.	N/A	705	809	1,086	1,477
MS, Quality Assurance	N/A	N/A	N/A	363	741
BS, Vocational Ed.	N/A	312	564	221	186
MA, Vocational Ed.	N/A	449	304	268	108
TOTALS	11,889	16,204	20,131	23,466	20,499

APPENDIX C
Page 2 of 2 Pages

CONSORTIUM DATA BY ACADEMIC YEARS 1982-87

Number of Applicants

Program	1982-83	1983-84	1984-85	1985-86	1986-87
BS, Business Admin.	N/A	N/A	N/A	41	22
MA, Environ. Plan.	30	26	31	11	6
BS, Health Care Admin.	41	38	37	25	19
MS, Health Care Admin.	62	118	95	114	48
BS, Hotel & Rest. Admin.	N/A	6	18	N/A	N/A
BS, Nursing	779	916	1,113	950	834
MS, Nursing	N/A	N/A	163	168	146
Master Public Admin.	52	67	75	108	74
MS, Quality Assurance	N/A	N/A	N/A	62	57
BS, Vocational Ed.	18	33	81	30	22
MA, Vocational Ed.	29	14	24	14	2
TOTALS	1,011	1,218	1,637	1,523	1,230

Number of Graduates

BS, Business Admin.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1*
MA, Environ. Plan.	6	5	28	10	30
BS, Health Care Admin.	8	12	11	9	10
MS, Health Care Admin.	11	11	12	23	21
BA, Liberal Arts	11	5	1	N/A	N/A
BS, Nursing	33	99	178	234	322
MS, Nursing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	13
Master Public Admin.	19	9	13	31	33
MS, Quality Assurance	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
BS, Vocational Ed.	4	8	1	5	3
MA, Vocational Ed.	22	18	12	13	7
TOTALS	114	167	256	325	440

* Student completing degree requirements from Consortium business program operating prior to 1982.

Note: Under terms of an agreement entered into with CSU, Fresno in Fall, 1984, 54 MBA candidates were awarded degrees in 1986-87. This program was conducted in Somalia.

APPENDIX D

STATEMENT FROM THE MASTER PLAN RENEWED RE: A GUARANTEE OF EQUITY FOR OLDER, PART-TIME STUDENTS

APPENDIX D

A GUARANTEE OF EQUITY FOR OLDER, PART-TIME STUDENTS

The following statement is quoted from pages 25-26 of THE MASTER PLAN RENEWED (Sacramento: July, 1987), the final report of the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education:

"There are implicit assumptions throughout the 1960 Master Plan that college students would continue to be ethnically homogenous, well-prepared, recent high school graduates who would attend college on a full-time basis. The organization of California's four-year universities continues to reflect these assumptions (with important exceptions at some CSU campuses), but with the urbanization of the state and its rapidly changing demographics, student characteristics have begun to change significantly: the average age of the graduating college senior is beyond 24, and the average age of the Community College student is 30; an increasing number of students need to work; many former students are "retooling," coming back to Community Colleges or four-year colleges for new skills or a second B.A.; there are more reentry students, particularly women, returning to college to finish degrees; and more students need to make up course deficiencies or take noncredit remedial offerings and thus take longer to complete a degree.

The Commission has emphasized the centrality of the transfer function to the successful operation of the educational system. Yet one of the clearest barriers to student progression is the "full-time" nature of education at the University of California and, to a lesser degree, the California State University. Some 70 percent of Community College students are employed at least thirty-five hours per week, but it is very difficult to combine full-time employment and study at the University of California. The California State University system does somewhat better, but students who must work full-time during the day may find it difficult to take the classes they need to graduate.

The trend toward the older, part-time student who works and has a family is clear. The Community Colleges have been responsive, but the need to adapt university programs to accomodate those students who wish to perusue a baccalaureate degree is apparent. Therefore, the Commission recommends that:

10. The California State University shall have responsibility for meeting the needs of older, part-time students who desire to pursue the baccalaureate degree. The University of California, however, shall seek to accomodate those students whose aspirations lead them to that institution. The role and mission statements of both segments must contain a specific commitment to integrating such students who are eligible to matriculate into academic degree programs. The Regents and the Trustees shall make whatever specific organizational changes are necessary to carry out that commitment, and shall review and where necessary adapt admission standards for older students to account for the skills and experience that are a better measure of potential success than are out-of-date high school records.

The Governor and Legislature shall further express the state's commitment to equity for older, part-time students by funding at the University of California and the California State University all courses and programs leading to degrees for matriculated students, whether on campus or off campus."

APPENDIX E

CSU BOARD OF TRUSTEE AGENDA ITEM AND RESOLUTION ON OFF-CAMPUS INSTRUCTION (MAY 25-26, 1976)

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 3
January 27-28, 1976

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON OFF-CAMPUS INSTRUCTION

Presentation By

Dr. Claudia H. Hampton, Trustee

Alex C. Sherriffs, Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Robert O. Bess, State University Dean
Academic Affairs

Summary

On July 9, 1975, the Board of Trustees directed the Chancellor to appoint a special Task Force to consider the implications of expanding Off-Campus Instruction and requested that a report be presented at its September 23-24 meeting. A brief discussion of the report was held by the Educational Policies Committee at that meeting. Subsequently, the report has been under further study. Staff has been examining the report and its ramifications with particular reference to external degree programs, availability of funding, and continuing education programs generally.

This agenda item consists of additional background information, and a proposed resolution which would give direction to continued study and serve as a foundation for further participation in discussion of implicit public policy issues with other state officials. A copy of the Task Force Report is included as an attachment.

Recommended Action

Adoption of the proposed resolution.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON OFF-CAMPUS INSTRUCTION

Background

Beginning in 1971, The California State University and Colleges undertook to expand its base for service to the part-time student by initiating a series of pilot degree programs, generally at locations physically removed from the campuses. Because of their experimental nature and the frequently specialized purposes to be served, these "external" degree programs are offered through Continuing Education. Students in these programs pay fees for the cost of instruction.

In 1974, another pilot effort aimed at the part-time student was initiated. This program, referred to as "Off-Campus Instruction," permits the limited offering of regular courses to fully matriculated students in facilities provided by other schools, public agencies and businesses.

Off-Campus Instruction differs from external degree programs in several respects:

1. As suggested by the name, external degree programs constitute planned cycles of courses and other educational activities which make up a total upper-division or graduate degree program. Off-Campus Instruction consists of individual courses approved for offering on a term-by-term basis. While a student may utilize these courses to satisfy degree requirements, no long-term commitment is made, and it is almost always necessary for students to combine such study with on-campus enrollment;

2. External degree programs are supported from a fee assessed for each unit of credit taken, and students are admitted only to the particular program. Off-Campus Instruction involves an allocation of existing General Fund support to offer regular campus courses at other locations. Students are matriculated, subject to established admission requirements and pay only the Student Services fee, student body fees, non-resident tuition (where applicable), and miscellaneous fees;

3. External degree programs represent a comprehensive plan of instruction, program evaluation, and budgeting based upon multi-year projections of enrollment and fee income. Off-Campus Instruction reflects short-term utilization of resources already budgeted for regular instruction. No extraordinary funding is provided either in the form of fee income or specifically earmarked General Fund support.

Task Force on Off-Campus Instruction

The Task Force was established following a staff recommendation that Board policy for Off-Campus Instruction be expanded to permit the offering of full degree programs off campus. In the main, the Task Force assignment was to consider the differences and similarities between these two modes of extended higher education. It did so and concluded that given the nature of the students and most of the programs, it would be more appropriate to include the majority of external degree programs within the regular support budget. However, it also concluded that any policy change resulting in significant enrollment growth in the regular program must assume new budget resources to avoid a loss of quality in either off-campus or on-campus programs.

The Task Force Report (Attachment A) also addressed matters such as limits on instruction to be offered, students to be served, quality control, fees, and budgeting. It also recognized the implications of its recommendations for ongoing continuing education activities. This has led the Chancellor to initiate a comprehensive study of continuing education, including consideration of the relationship of its particular mission to the overall mission of The California State University and Colleges. This study will address such questions as: What types of educational programs should be offered in the future, and which should be essentially self-supporting? What types of students are to be served and under what circumstances? This study should contribute to the bases for development of coherent ongoing policy concerning what might best be referred to as the "extended campus."

Postsecondary Alternatives Study

On October 19, the Assembly Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education released the report, *Postsecondary Alternatives to Meet the Educational Needs of California's Adults.* This report was commissioned in response to SCR 81 (1973), authored by then Senator Dymally, which was in turn in response to a proposal of the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education that there be a fourth public segment of higher education.

Many of the report's recommendations have direct implications for The California State University and Colleges. A number of them raise very serious policy questions and will be addressed separately. However, those which call for expansion of existing opportunities for part-time and adult students are especially significant with regard to our own Task Force study. For example, the Postsecondary Alternatives study recommends comparable state support for both on-campus and off-campus programs and the establishment of a fourth segment to provide certain educational services. The relevance of the latter for this system is heightened because the report cites The Consortium of The California State University and Colleges as a feasible alternative to a fourth segment.

The Assembly Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education has devoted two interim hearings to the report. Both were well attended by Committee members and "guest" legislators, and a high level of interest was in evidence. The activities of the Committee could lead to public policy decisions on off-campus education during the next legislative session.

Funding Prospects

Pending a more definitive conclusion based upon proposed legislation now being drafted and actual committee votes, it would appear that the Legislature is disposed to expand educational opportunity for part-time and adult students but is likewise highly sensitive to attendant cost implications. As noted, both the Task Force and the Postsecondary Alternative study include recommendations for General Fund support for external programs.

The Statewide Academic Senate has endorsed this position. If such funding is justifiable, its achievement is unlikely in view of current fiscal circumstances. Funding, even for current overenrollment in on-campus programs, is problematic. In this context, to request still additional funding to replace fees now paid by students for external programs would seem to represent little more than a gesture.

The Need For Further Study and Dialogue

In light of current fiscal realities and the need to achieve greater clarity on related issues, staff is unable to recommend that General Fund support for external programs be sought for 1976-77. It is, however, critical that the entire matter be studied further and be the subject of continued consideration. The following questions need to be explored and answered:

1. How can equity best be achieved among various student groups now being assessed differing types and levels of fees in connection with their educational programs?

2. Should policy regarding tuition be reexamined? Is there a better basis for determining the relative burden to be borne by the state and the student?

3. Are traditional distinctions between "regular" and "continuing" education still valid or should there be a greater integration of both programs and bases of support?

4. What course and program offerings are appropriate to the mission of The California State University and Colleges? Should such determinations be based on content? Purpose? Student characteristics? Geographic location? Some or all of these?

5. Are current admission and enrollment priorities either reasonable or defensible in view of increased public concern for the educational needs of the part-time student?

These are difficult questions. Some imply that traditional approaches to fee assessment might be changed. Indeed, if the state's educational needs are to be met through extended higher education, there seems to be but three funding options:

1. Continue to charge instructional fees for most students enrolled at off-campus locations regardless of the degree of similarity between off-campus students and programs and on-campus students and programs.

2. Obtain state support for added enrollment associated with extended education.

3. Adjust fees for both groups of students to ensure that additional enrollment can be accommodated without lowering quality and to ensure that all students are treated equitably.

Answers to questions raised above should provide the basis for a rational and equitable position on off-campus education and for defending it once taken.

The process of resolving these complex issues will require dialogue with the legislative and executive branches, and other educational institutions and agencies as well as more internal study and discussion. Meanwhile, it seems essential that we continue to operate extended programs as we have done to date. This means that we will continue to offer regular instruction off campus on a limited basis, permitting only those courses which can be offered within budgeted resources and to the extent that quality is not jeopardized. Beyond this, degree programs off campus will need to be essentially self-supporting. Through this combination of effort we will be doing all that we can reasonably do to meet the needs of California's citizenry until such time as public policy is clarified.

The following resolution is proposed to provide a current reflection of Board policy for the guidance of staff and to inform various external agencies.

> **RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges, that the report of the Task Force on Off-Campus Instruction is hereby received and acknowledged and that thanks are extended to its members for its thorough analysis of the basic issue; and be it further
>
> **RESOLVED,** That the Chancellor continue his efforts to ensure thorough consideration of all related issues with the objective of progressing toward a coherent and workable policy concerning extended higher education; and be it further
>
> **RESOLVED,** That this process include consideration of fee equity, tuition policy, the relationship of continuing education and regular programs, course offerings appropriate to the mission of the system and the proper framework in which to offer them and the relationships of current admission and enrollment priorities to part-time and adult students; and be it further
>
> **RESOLVED,** That pending further study the Board of Trustees reaffirms established policy which permits limited offering of regular instruction at off-campus locations together with campus and Consortium external degree programs offered on a fee basis for those Californians for whom regular programs are not, for all practical purposes, available.

ATTACHMENT A
Ed. Pol. – Item 3
January 27-28, 1976

REPORT OF THE
TASK FORCE ON OFF-CAMPUS INSTRUCTION

The California State University and Colleges

September 1975

Foreword

On July 9, 1975 the Board of Trustees of The California State University and Colleges directed the Chancellor to appoint a special task force to consider the implications of off-campus instruction. The Board's resolution further provided for a report to be presented at its September 1975 meeting.

Immediately following the July meeting, Board Chairman Robert Hornby appointed three Trustee members and an alternate. Concurrently, Chancellor Dumke, in consultation with the Council of Presidents and the Statewide Academic Senate, appointed additional members including a President, Academic Vice President, Dean of Continuing Education, Business Manager, Associated Student Body President, two teaching faculty and three State University Deans from his staff.

During the month following establishment of the Task Force, staff synthesized existing information and developed a series of background papers which provided needed facts and a point of departure for initial discussions. In view of the limited time available to meet its charge, the Task Force convened for an intensive two-day work session on August 18-19. The report that follows is the product of that meeting and one additional meeting held on August 28.

Members of the Task Force wish to express appreciation to the many staff members who assisted it in carrying out its charge, especially Martha Brady who handled meeting arrangements and distribution of background materials and Pam Zamora who served as Task Force Secretary.

TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

Dr. Claudia H. Hampton, Trustee (Chairman)

Mr. Frank P. Adams, Trustee

Dr. Edwin N. Becker
Professor of Chemistry
California State University, Long Beach

Dr. Robert O. Bess
State University Dean
Academic Affairs
Office of the Chancellor

Dr. Raymond J. Endres
Dean of Continuing Education
California State University, Sacramento

Mr. Marc Jensen
Student Body President
California State University, Hayward

Dr. Gerald C. Marley
Chairman, Academic Senate
The California State University and Colleges

Dr. Alistair W. McCrone
President
Humboldt State University

Dr. Ralph D. Mills
State University Dean
Continuing Education
Office of the Chancellor

Dr. Anthony J. Moye
State University Dean
Educational Programs and Resources
Office of the Chancellor

Dr. Mary Jean Pew, Trustee

Mr. Arthur Suguitan
Business Manager
California State University, Long Beach

Dr. Charles E. Swanson
Vice President for Academic Affairs
California State University, Fresno

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword i

Task Force Membership ii

Summary of Major Recommendations 1

The Problem 3

Background 3

The Mission of The California State University and Colleges 5

Fees and Public Policy 5

Should We Teach Off-Campus? 6

The Central Issue 7

What Limits Should There Be? 7

Meeting Increased Costs 8

Special Fee Provision 12

The Consortium of The California State University and Colleges 14

Impact on Self-Support Extension and Summer Session Programs 14

Other Issues 16

Further Study 17

Appendix: Budgetary Adjustment Requirement to Provide State Support for CSUC External Degree Program

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force recommends that:

1. The California State University and Colleges should offer degree oriented instruction at off-campus locations.

2. Students should not be required to pay instructional fees solely on the basis of location. Equity demands that off-campus programs for matriculated students be incorporated into the regular support budget.

3. Any change in policy regarding off-campus instruction which would result in significant enrollment growth must be accompanied by adequate budgetary resources to ensure both its quality and the continued quality of on-campus programs.

4. Off-campus instruction should be limited to upper division and graduate level (except in the limited instance of programs conducted in cooperation with secondary schools and community colleges).

5. Off-campus instruction should be provided only for that segment of the population previously defined as CSUC eligible.

6. New courses should be subject to the same review whether to be offered on campus or off.

7. New program concentrations or majors should be subject to the same academic master planning considerations as are required for on-campus offerings.

8. Off-campus instruction should not be permitted to grow beyond the point where it ceases to be an integral part of the total campus program.

9. State supported off-campus instruction should be limited to offerings scheduled in the context of the regular academic calendar.

10. Each decision concerning off-campus instruction should be based upon a campus determination as to the best possible use of the resources available to that campus.

11. Standard procedures should be utilized in budgeting for increased FTE resulting from off-campus enrollment, with the possible exception of travel costs.

12. The Board should seek an adjustment to the 1976-77 budget through the processes generally utilized to accommodate the additional enrollment to be served through off-campus instruction.

13. The Student Services Fee and the Facilities Fee should be the same for on-campus and off-campus students.

14. Each campus should propose a fee structure for student body membership and student centers responsive to its particular needs and circumstances.

15. Some sort of consortium structure should be maintained as an effective means of stimulating the creative energies of faculty. Its particular form, range of activities and level of support should be the subject of continuing study.

16. Each president should have the authority to grant assigned time to faculty in instances where he or she determine that a particular off-campus offering involves excessive travel.

17. No current CSUC faculty member should be required to teach off-campus:

18. All new appointments should include notification that off-campus instruction may be included as part of a normal teaching assignment.

19. The Chancellor should report to the Board annually concerning degree oriented off-campus instruction until the activity has been entirely regularized.

The Problem

Present policy provides that in general off-campus instructional activity is separate and apart from the regular instructional program and is largely self-supporting. For purposes of discussion, the Task Force assumes that off-campus instruction includes: (a) external degree programs (sponsored by a campus or The Consortium); (b) degree oriented coursework; (c) extension (credit/non-credit); and (d) summer session. This report is concerned primarily with (a) and (b). However, attention was also given to how policy changes might affect (c) and (d). The problem set before the Task Force was to determine if there should be policy differences between degree oriented instruction on-campus and off-campus. If no significant differences were found the Task Force would need to address the following questions: Should there be off-campus instruction? If so, what limits are appropriate? What alternatives exist for funding the resultant addition to regular enrollment? Should there be special fee provisions?

In order to gain its bearings the Task Force first examined the question of our mission as a system of higher education and our efforts to date to meet that portion of the mission which addresses the part-time adult learner.

Background

It is important in considering the current scene and future mission of The California State University and Colleges with reference to the part-time adult learner to recognize that we have had several decades of experience. Indeed, serving the part-time student has been so integral a part of regular degree offerings that it has been extremely difficult to isolate the kind of information necessary to demonstrate its true magnitude.

Even in 1935-36 (the earliest year for which data is available) a substantial number of students were enrolling on a part-time basis. By Fall 1972, more than a third of all students were enrolled part-time (fewer than 12 units). The majority (64 percent) were 25 or older. Nearly 20 percent were 35 or older.

While there is no separate "part-time" or "evening" program in The California State University and Colleges, all campuses operate on an extended academic day, typically from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Wherever possible, campuses schedule classes so that degree programs can be completed exclusively through late afternoon, evening and, in a few instances, weekend attendance. As a consequence there are now some 170 bachelor's and 180 master's degree programs which can be completed exclusively through evening course attendance.

In 1971 The California State University and Colleges undertook a new direction in its effort to serve the part-time adult learner by establishing the Commission on External Degree Programs. Under its aegis the campuses are offering 37 degree programs at times and in locations chosen to meet the particular needs of this student group. In addition, two programs are offered through The Consortium of The California State University and Colleges utilizing the resources of several campuses. Due to the experimental nature of these efforts and the concommitant concern that diversion of available state fiscal support would have an adverse impact upon regular programs, it was determined that external degree programs should be largely self-supporting. Thus, they have been established and delivered within the framework of Continuing Education and its separate revenue fund. With the exception of a small amount of state support for consortium program development activity and for fee waivers for low income enrollees, these external degree programs are dependent upon student fees for meeting all instructional and related administrative costs. The table below summarizes costs and sources of funding associated with these programs during 1974-75.

EXTERNAL DEGREE PROGRAM FISCAL DATA FOR 1974-75

A.	Continuing Education Revenue Fund (Self-Support Program)	
	1. Estimated Revenue from Student Fees	$1,438,350
	2. Estimated Revenue per FTE Student	1,290
B.	State Appropriated Funds	
	1. Fee Waiver Program Appropriation	120,000
	2. Consortium Appropriation	185,860
C.	Average State Support per FTE	270

Another experimental effort designed to gain further insight into degree oriented education off-campus was initiated in 1974-75 following Board of Trustee action authorizing the scheduling of a limited number of regular courses at off-campus locations. Under this authority the Chancellor approved a total of 60 courses offered by 10 campuses during Spring 1975. Fourteen hundred and seven students were enrolled. Projected for a full academic year this would represent some 300 FTE.

All three types of educational delivery appear to serve similar students with virtually identical educational purposes.

The Mission of
The California State University and Colleges

Before moving to specific questions regarding off-campus instruction the Task Force examined its mission as set forth in the Master Plan for Higher Education, the Donahoe Act and as subsequently reinforced or modified by further legislative actions. The Donahoe Act provides in Section 22606 of the Education Code:

> "The primary function of the State Colleges is the provision of instruction for undergraduate students and graduate students, through the master's degree, in the liberal arts and sciences, in applied fields and in the professions, including the teaching profession...."

This was reaffirmed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor in the form of AB 3011 in July 1974. While the Act itself does not specify to whom such instruction shall be provided, a combination of Master Plan recommendations, positions of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education and the California Postsecondary Education Commission and legislative resolutions lead to a common understanding that individuals who are among the upper one third of high school graduates and those who satisfactorily complete two years of college level work elsewhere constitute the fundamental pool from which CSUC students are drawn. Recent legislative actions have not only reaffirmed our mission; they have also made explicit the long implied policy that part-time students should not be discriminated against. Finally, while the place of lower division instruction within The California State University and Colleges has been upheld repeatedly, the Legislature has made clear that all reasonable effort should be extended to accommodate *all* qualified community college transfers within the system. This policy coupled with the so-called 60 percent/40 percent upper division/lower division enrollment mix objective suggests a special responsibility for advanced undergraduate instruction.

Fees and Public Policy

One additional background issue was examined by the Task Force. This involved the matter of the use of student fees to support the instructional mission of The California State University and Colleges. The job was greatly simplified by the thorough coverage given to this subject by the September 1974 Task Force on the Materials and Services Fee.

Beginning with the Organic Act of 1868 which established the University of California through its reaffirmation in the Master

Plan for Higher Education nearly a century later, until today, the State has taken the position that "...tuition shall be free to all residents of the State...." While practice has not always been entirely consistent with principle, deviations have been slight.

In 1970, the Board of Trustees sought legislative authority to establish a tuition fee to provide a framework for financial aid for needy students and to improve educational quality. The Legislature refused to enact enabling legislation during that or subsequent sessions. Thus, while one may argue that circumstances have changed, public policy at this time precludes the assessment of instructional fees for regular instructional programs. Extension courses and summer sessions do not fall within this proscription.

Should We Teach Off-Campus?

The Task Force took the position that it would be difficult to conceive of The California State University and Colleges being fully responsive to its mission as currently conceived without offering instruction at off-campus locations.

Foremost in arriving at this determination was concern for improved student access. Other factors influenced the Task Force decision as well. These included: increased potential for cooperation among educational agencies and with government, business and industry in the use of resources, conservation of energy, the possibility of utilizing limited instructional resources more efficiently, and the enrichment of the educational process which can accompany use of specialized off-campus facilities.

A final factor in leading the Task Force to its conclusion was the place of off-campus instruction in meeting the needs envisioned in the so-called "Fourth Segment Study." The Task Force is firmly convinced that The California State University and Colleges has demonstrated its capability to meet these needs through a combination of on- and off-campus traditional and non-traditional instruction as demonstrated by activities over the past four years involving innovative activities and external degree programs.

In short, *the Task Force believes that The California State University and Colleges should offer degree oriented instruction at off-campus locations.*

The Central Issue

As noted earlier the Task Force saw as the basic question before it: Is there a rational basis for making a determination as to whether matriculated students should pay instructional fees when enrolled in degree courses solely on the basis of location? *The Task Force concluded that there was not and that equity demands that the programs be incorporated into the regular support budget.* While the Task Force had little difficulty in arriving at this position, it saw the need for definite limits. Paramount among these is a conviction that *the regular enrollment growth which would accompany significant revision of policy regarding off-campus instruction must be accompanied by adequate budgetary resources to insure both its quality and the continued quality of on-campus programs.* This is addressed in greater detail later in this report with reference to funding alternatives.

What Limits Should There Be?

While adequate financing is a prerequisite, there are other limits which should guide regular off-campus educational activities in which the system becomes involved. The Task Force believes that the following limitations should apply systemwide.

1. Level of Instruction

While the mission of the system generally encompasses all levels of undergraduate as well as master's level instruction, the extension of this mission *off-campus should be limited to upper division and graduate level instruction (except in the limited instance of programs conducted in cooperation with secondary schools and community colleges).* Such limitations recognize that one hundred community colleges, many with their own off-campus locations, continue to have fundamental responsibility for providing lower division instruction at off-campus locations.

2. Eligibility for Admission

Instruction should be provided only for that segment of the population previously defined as CSUC eligible. Off-campus instruction should not be designed for or opened to students who would not be admitted to on-campus programs. Students are admitted to the University--not to a certain type of instruction.

3. Quality Control

A. Program: *New courses should be subject to the same review whether to be offered on- or off-campus. Likewise, new program concentrations or majors should be subject to the same academic master planning considerations as are required for current on-campus offerings.*

b. Faculty: While the Task Force does not envision total off-campus enrollment constituting more than a very minor part of total enrollment, on any particular campus *it must not be allowed to grow beyond the point where it ceases to be an integral part of the total campus program,* subject to the same methods of faculty recruitment, peer review of performance, faculty participation in program evaluation, and so forth. To illustrate: while part-time faculty provide invaluable service both on- and off-campus, their numbers and assigned responsibilities should never result in loss of a fully involved core faculty which is responsible for continually redefining its programs. This is not a new problem, simply one which can become more real because of special staffing needs which might accompany the growth of off-campus instruction.

c. Support resources: *Instruction off-campus should be limited not only by program considerations and availability of qualified instructors, but by support resources as well.* Provision must be made for adequate library facilities and advising (where the student cannot be expected to make occasional trips to campus). The Task Force recognizes that there are numerous configurations that will "work" depending upon the particular setting.

d. Calendar: *State supported off-campus instruction should be limited to offerings scheduled at times which follow the regular academic calendar.*

Finally, the Task Force believes that *each decision concerning off-campus instruction must be based upon a campus determination to make the best possible use of the resources available to it.* Thus, it does not envision a special pocket for off-campus FTE. Indeed it believes that following this guideline will almost always lead to offering a course on-campus when the combination of demand and resources requires that a choice be made.

Meeting Increased Costs

The Task Force examined the issue of costs from two perspectives: first it considered what the basis for estimating off-campus costs should be; then it considered alternatives for meeting whatever costs might be expected to arise from enrollment growth resulting from incorporating off-campus instruction into the regular support budget.

A. Costs: On the basis of experience over the past four years, a consensus has emerged that there is probably no significant difference between the cost of off-campus and on-campus instruction. This opinion has been partially validated by a study carried out by Wyman Hicks on costs of external degrees under the auspices of the Commission on External Degree Programs. It is true that such costs as faculty travel, space rental, and special library needs might be viewed as added costs. However, it is likewise true that the type of courses which can most readily be taken off-campus (lecture, discussion, seminar) are less expensive than the type least likely to be exported (laboratory, studio). The Task Force believes that it is most probable that the variance among program costs on-campus is greater than the variance between on-campus and off-campus courses. Thus, *it recommends that with the possible exception of provision for travel costs, standard procedures be utilized in budgeting for increased FTE resulting from off-campus enrollment.* Having taken this position, *it recommends that costs of off-campus instruction be a subject of continued study.*

There is a general consensus that given present admissions policies and programmatic direction, off-campus instruction is not likely to have a major impact upon enrollment in the foreseeable future. Staff estimates suggest that even under the most favorable conditions, off-campus enrollment is unlikely to exceed five percent of total enrollment by 1980. This should serve to underscore the position that the intent of regularizing off-campus instruction is to achieve equity for students for whom we have a responsibility rather than to achieve new growth for its own sake.

A more immediate concern than long term growth is the source of funding for current off-campus generated enrollment. While the detailed information necessary to identify specific increased budget requirements is not available at this time, information available to the Task Force indicates a total of $4,500,000* constitutes a reasonable estimate.

---

* See Appendix for a detailed discussion of how this estimate was developed.

B. Alternatives for Funding: The Task Force has already recommended that conversion of external programs not be undertaken unless adequate resources can be identified to ensure proper support and maintenance of quality. It also gave consideration to a number of alternatives for obtaining necessary support. Each is described briefly below:

1. Absorption within existing budgetary resources. After careful consideration of this alternative, *the Task Force concluded that it would not be possible to maintain acceptable quality levels if significant additional FTE were absorbed within existing budgetary resources.* Present indications are that system enrollment projections are "on target" and that the effect of inflation on instructional support costs will exceed anticipated budget increases for 1976-77. There has, in fact, already been substantial absorption within the system. Over the past five years growth has occurred in programs requiring lower student faculty ratios. Additional faculty resulting from overall growth have fallen short of meeting this need by approximately 150 positions. It is probable that use of existing budgetary resources are so limited that they could not even accommodate slight growth in the existing regularly supported off-campus instructional program. *The Task Force believes it would be unfair to convert or extend full degree programs or major portions thereof in the absence of a firm basis of support, especially in view of the long term commitment such actions would imply.*

2. Increased fees. While the Task Force concluded early in its deliberations that equity demanded that geography not be the basis for charging instructional fees, it did consider the alternative of a modest level of instructional fee for all or certain categories of students to meet the costs of added enrollment. In doing so it considered the following ideas which have been suggested in recent months.

   a. General tuition. Statutory authority exists to charge up to $25.00 in tuition fees to all students. The Board could seek legislation to extend this authority to permit an even higher level. However, such an approach would impose some degree of financial barrier depending upon amount and socio-economic level of students and their families. For this reason alone, *the Task Force does not believe this is a practical alternative.*

b. Ability to pay. A variety of proposals have been set forth which involve fee payment on the basis of individual and family ability to pay. Generally, these proposals involve a standard fee which is waived totally or partially on the basis of income and assets. Other forms involve a deferral of fee liability until the student achieves a given income level following attendance. One variation would involve the reversal of the reduction or waiver approach, assessing a fee only for those exceeding a specified income level. *The Task Force believes that any system of fees should make provision for ability to pay.*

c. Age. It has been proposed that adults, over the traditional college age, say 25, be required to pay tuition. *The Task Force believes that there is no rational basis for a differentiation on age alone and that such an approach would not be workable.*

d. Program. Certain programs are more costly than others and there are varying levels of social demand for graduates of different programs. Cost differentials could be passed along to students and/or fee levels could serve as a device for encouraging or discouraging enrollment in particular programs. *The Task Force concluded that even if sufficient expertise were available to make such judgements that it would be inappropriate to do so.*

e. Level of Instruction. This approach would partially mesh with existing public policy. Lower division instruction might be provided without instructional fees, paralleling the benefit accorded the majority of the State's students who attend community colleges. There might then be relatively low instructional fees for upper division students and still higher fees for graduate and second baccalaureate students. *Such an approach would have the advantage of a greater degree of intersegmental fee equity.*

Present public policy concerning tuition free higher education is clear. *The Task Force recommends that the Board of Trustees not pursue the matter of instructional fees of any kind.*

3. Reallocation of budgetary priorities. Consideration might be given to funding off-campus instruction by the reallocation of funds budgeted for other programs based on a determination of budget priorities. Unlike absorption, this approach assumes the elimination of some program, service or activity in favor of implementation of another.

4. Roll-forward authorization. While excess savings at the end of the fiscal year have been diminishing from year to year as budgets become more stringent, it is possible that some portion of the additional enrollment costs could be met in this way. *Authorization of state funding agencies would be a prerequisite.*

5. Budget adjustment. After the initial year of state support, the FTE generated by service to additional students at off-campus locations would be built into budget projections routinely. However, conversion would create a one-time enrollment bulge which would need to be treated separate from review and submission of the basic system budget. *The Task Force recommends that the Board seek such a budget adjustment for 1976-77 through processes generally utilized for this purpose.*

Special Fee Provision

Accompanying establishment of the Task Force was a specific request that it consider whether certain regular fees should be reduced or eliminated for off-campus students. The Task Force considered this question. In addition it explored the possibility that circumstances might justify establishment of special fees.

There does not appear to be a basis for establishing a special fee for off-campus instruction per se. However, certain non-traditional approaches to instruction which are perhaps more likely to occur in the context of off-campus degree programs might justify special fees in some instances. Some could be assessed within existing authority; others would require new authorization. To illustrate: off-campus students may be more likely to study independently and to challenge courses by examination. Currently, an examination fee up to $10 can be assessed. This amount is generally inadequate for the costs involved. There is no basis for charging any sort of guidance or tutorial fee for assistance associated with independent study unless the student is actually enrolled. Certain off-campus programs may require extensive use of special instructional materials (study guides, cassettes, slides, etc.) and equipment (recorders, phone hookups, etc.). Insofar as such requirements exceed those typically associated with instruction and insofar as they result in reduction of other expenses such as travel, a special materials fee might be in order.

The Task Force recommends that the need for special fees be addressed independently of consideration of a policy on off-campus instruction since the issue seems to focus on instructional mode rather than location.

The question of exempting off-campus enrollees from certain fees ordinarily assessed against regular students is more complex. Every student pays a Student Services Fee, a student body membership fee (on 17 campuses), a facilities fee and a student body center fee (on 16 campuses). It can be argued that the off-campus student will not use student services to the extent the on-campus student does. Yet the services are available for those who choose to use them. Many are available without reference to the students' location. Some off-campus students make greater use of student services than some on-campus students. Student body membership presents a similar issue. In both instances students do not pay for services received. They pay a share of the total cost of services available.

The Task Force recommends the following appraoches to the two types of basic fees which would ordinarily be charged to regular students:

1. *There should be no reduction of the Student Services Fee or the Facilities Fee for off-campus students. Instead, efforts should be addressed to improving off-campus student access to student services.* In this context, "access" should be viewed as both availability and appropriateness of the services.

2. Existing authority should be utilized in determining the level of student body membership and student body center fees to be assessed against particular off-campus students. (Under Board delegation the Chancellor sets these fees. His actions are based upon Presidential recommendations. Presidents in turn rely upon student body organization advice in framing these recommendations.) *Each campus should be requested to propose a fee structure responsive to its particular needs and circumstances. All students should be required to pay minimum fees (approximately $1.00 per term for each membership and center).* The level of fees should bear a relationship to opportunity to derive benefit from the service funded.

The Consortium of The California State University and Colleges

The Task Force had particular difficulty in dealing with the issue of the place of The Consortium in the delivery of off-campus instruction. This difficulty arose not from doubt that it served a valuable function, but rather because it does not fit neatly into existing operations when a shift to state support is contemplated. Insofar as FTE is concerned, that generated by Consortium programs can be handled by assigning it to the campuses offering the instruction either within a proposed budget or as a post-budgetary allocation. It is the administrative and program development functions of The Consortium which present a special situation.

Aside from the instruction actually offered by the campuses under its sponsorship, the present and potential role of The Consortium involves activities which do not generate enrollment directly and therefore do not generate budget resources. These activities fall within the framework of inter-campus coopereration and involve development of new and unique approaches to learning.

The Task Force believes that a means of giving focus to such cooperation within the system is invaluable in maintaining continued vitality. It does not, however, believe that its charge extends to a specific delineation of the desirable and proper functions of a consortial entity or the level of support necessary. Therefore, *the Task Force recommends that some sort of Consortium structure be maintained as an effective means of stimulating the creative energies of faculty and that its particular form, range of activities and level of support be the subject of continuing study.*

Impact on Self-Support Extension and Summer Session Programs

It is important to recognize that the impact of a major shift of state supported instruction off-campus will be almost entirely negative, particularly with respect to short term effects on extension and (to a lesser degree) summer session program revenues.

External degree programs are presently operated within the fiscal vehicle of the Continuing Education Program Revenue Fund. Fees collected from students in external degree programs are deposited in this fund. If these programs are converted to state support and if individual state-supported courses are offered in greater numbers at off-campus locations, the following effects can be anticipated:

1. Revenues will suffer a serious decline since external degree program fees accounted for approximately 25 percent of all 1974-75 extension program revenues. Since these programs represent the single largest area of growth in the overall extension program, converting external degree programs to state support will significantly reduce future program revenues as well. In addition, state-supported degree programs and courses offered off-campus may attract some students who have traditionally enrolled in individual extension and summer session courses.

2. Any decline in continuing education program revenue could displace continuing education personnel and create some personal hardships. As external degree programs have been expanded during recent years, campus Continuing Education offices have added staff to carry the additional workload. With the loss of program revenues that have sustained these positions, the continuing education program budget will either have to absorb the additional overhead costs or eliminate the positions. While it may be possible to shift some positions to state support, this is not likely to be a complete solution.

3. The Chancellor's Office budget for Continuing Education is funded through an overhead assessment against campus extension and summer session program revenues. A decline in campus program revenues will have an effect on the central office budget as well.

4. Annual extension and summer session program *net* revenues (surpluses) will be diminished or, for many campuses, will disappear. Campuses having accumulated reserves may need to utilize these funds to off-set program deficits until adjustments to decreased levels of income have been accomplished.

5. Campus contributions to the systemwide Continuing Education Program Development Fund (each campus contributes 25 percent of its net extension revenues) will be reduced or eliminated. Under current conditions, some campuses contribute very little to this fund. During the period required to adjust to the loss of revenues resulting from an expanded program of state-supported off-campus instruction, campuses with small campus reserves or no reserves will probably request financial support from the systemwide reserve, either to off-set budget deficits or to underwrite program development efforts. When these funds will be needed most, it is least likely that they will be available in the amounts needed.

6. One possible impact may be the re-examination of the system's program of continuing education--its mission and its organizational relationship with the regular, state-support program.

This is a matter which demands further study.

Other Issues

When a topic of such magnitude is addressed numerous corollary issues are usually identified. The experience of this Task Force was no different. Most of them involve procedural matters and we found that the vast majority could be dealt with by application of existing policies, procedures and regulations as they apply to regular instruction on-campus. A few seemed worthy of particular attention. These questions and the Task Force's recommendations are listed below.

1. Should faculty involved in regular instruction off-campus receive additional compensation? No. However, *each president should have authority to grant assigned time in instances which in his or her judgement involve excessive travel.*

2. Should faculty be required to participate in off-campus instruction? It is in the nature of the academic process that no faculty member who seriously objects to off-campus teaching is likely to be asked to do so. However, to avoid misunderstanding, the Task Force believes that *faculty members now holding CSUC appointments should not be required to teach off-campus. However, all new appointments should make clear that off-campus instruction may be included as a part of a normal teaching assignment.*

3. Are special travel provisions necessary? No. Existing rules governing reimbursement for travel and definition of "headquarters" appear to be adequate.

4. Are there special faculty appointment problems? No. The same care and standards should be maintained regardless of where employed faculty are to teach. Campuses should not develop an "off-campus" faculty.

5. Does expanded off-campus instruction present special priority determination problems? No. While it will often be difficult to determine whether a course or program should be offered off-campus and, if so, whether it be offered at one location or another, the hard decisions to be made are no different than those which must now be

made in the on-campus context. As noted earlier, campus faculty and administrators will need to act consistent with a single principle--what constitutes the most effective use of limited educational resources?

6. Are there special financial aid needs? No. Students would have access to the same financial aid resources as on-campus students. It should, however, be noted that resources available to the part-time student are extremely limited due to existing regulations, primarily those associated with federal aid programs. Fortunately, within existing fee structures at least, the expenses of enrollment below the level required to qualify for aid (half-time) are minimal.

Further Study

While the Task Force has reached the conclusion that there is little essential difference between on-campus and off-campus instruction, it recognizes that there may be special costs and issues yet to be identified. Therefore, *it recommends that the Chancellor be requested to report annually to the Board concerning degree oriented off-campus instruction until such time as the activity has been entirely regularized.* These reports should give attention to such matters as the magnitude of activity, student, faculty and community attitudes, special cost elements, administrative problems identified and the manner in which they have been or might be resolved.

Appendix

BUDGETARY ADJUSTMENT REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE STATE SUPPORT FOR CSUC EXTERNAL DEGREE PROGRAM

In 1974-75, The California State University and Colleges enrolled 1,115 Full Time Equivalent students in its 34 self-supporting External Degree Programs. A total of 2,242 FTE are expected to enroll in 47 programs in 1975-76. It is estimated that 3,360 FTE will be enrolled in CSUC campus and Consortium sponsored External Degree Programs in 1976-77.

If the support costs for External Degree Programs and related activities were to be shifted to the state support budget for 1976-77, it would be necessary to allocate budgetary resources of approximately $4,500,000.

1. Campus External Degree Programs $ 3,514,000

   The amount indicated would provide marginal support for approximately 2,900 FTE (at the rate of $1,210 per FTE) expected to be enrolled in campus external degree programs.

2. The Consortium 926,000

   a. FTE Support Costs ($552,000)

      In 1976-77, 460 FTE are expected to be enrolled in Consortium degree programs. The $552,000 indicated would be required to provide marginal support for these students at the rate of $1,210 per FTE.

   b. Consortium Administration and Development ($374,000)

      Of the projected $374,000, $66,000 would support competency assessment and related program activities; $46,000 would support the development of inter-campus cooperative programs, particularly those leading to campus degrees. The remaining $262,000 would fund the systemwide administrative and development activities related to Consortium degree programs. (If the $374,000 is reduced by anticipated student application, graduation and materials and services fees--approximately $107,000--the net cost to the State would be $266,000.

3. UC/CSUC Ventura Learning Center 60,000

   UC and CSUC jointly staff and operate the Ventura Learning Center in leased facilities. During 1974-75 this Center served approximately 500 students, enrolling in UC and CSUC off-campus programs. It is estimated that the CSUC share of the Center's 1976-77 budget, including lease costs, would be approximately $60,000.

APPENDIX F

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CPEC REPORT, DEGREES OF DIVERSITY, RE: STATE SUPPORTED OFF-CAMPUS INSTRUCTION

MARCH 1980

DEGREES OF DIVERSITY

OFF-CAMPUS EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA
POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION
COMMISSION

California Postsecondary
Education Commission

Resolution 8-80

Approving
Degrees of Diversity: Off-Campus Education in California

WHEREAS, The Budget Act of 1978 directed the California Postsecondary Education Commission to:

> . . .define and study the various kinds of extended education with particular emphasis on degree oriented programs. Such study shall address questions of access, support, student needs, and quality.

and

WHEREAS, The Commission has received and reviewed the report entitled, Degrees of Diversity: Off-Campus Education in California, and

WHEREAS, The report has also been reviewed by the segments of higher education and by the Commission's Technical Advisory Committee on Off-Campus and Extended Degree Programs; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the California Postsecondary Education Commission approves and transmits this report to the Governor, the Legislature, and other appropriate officials.

Adopted
March 17, 1980

campus credit courses and programs at the upper division and master's levels has diminished unnecessary duplication of effort and is commendable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In providing funding for the off-campus programs of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, the Governor and the Legislature should give priority to:

   a. Degree programs, in preference to courses not leading to a degree at a single locale.

      All of the evidence reviewed in the development of this report supports the idea that off-campus degree programs are generally maintained at a high level of quality and that the graduates of those programs are as successful as on-campus graduates in securing employment or admission to academic programs for subsequent degrees.

   b. Upper division courses, in preference to graduate courses.

      Graduate programs generally require a greater array of resources than upper division programs. Many of the support services that are very expensive to provide, particularly libraries, are more important for graduate students than for undergraduates. Also, upper division programs serve greater numbers of students. Thus, for a given amount of resources, it is possible to serve more people effectively at the upper division level than at the graduate level. Also, as a matter of public policy, higher priority should be given to the needs of people who have not yet completed a baccalaureate program. It should be specified, however, that activities which originate on campus, such as field trips and student teaching activities, should not be considered as off-campus programs.

   c. Geographic areas and educational needs not presently served by accredited independent colleges and universities.

      As has been stated in many reports by responsible agencies, a strong and healthy independent system of higher education is of great benefit to California and should be maintained. With respect to off-campus programs, the public segments enjoy a competitive advantage in that their fees are generally lower than those charged by most independent colleges and universities. If expanded State funding for off-campus degree programs is approved, as recommended in this report, that advantage will increase. Accordingly, it may not be in the public interest to permit the public segments to establish new programs in close proximity to already established, similar offerings of accredited independent institutions.

2. In the California State University and Colleges, consistent with Recommendation 1, State support for external degree programs should be limited to the following numbers of students:

1980-81	1,600 Full-Time-Equivalent Students
1981-82	2,100 Full-Time-Equivalent Students
1982-83	2,600 Full-Time Equivalent Students

The exact dollar amount of this support per FTE student should be negotiated among the Governor, the Legislature, and the State University Board of Trustees, but should be sufficient: (1) to insure that students in State-supported external degree programs will be charged fees comparable to those for on-campus students; and (2)—to provide an adequate level of support services. The limits specified above should include all FTE students in the State University Consortium and in the four major off-campus centers in Northern San Diego County, Stockton, San Francisco and Ventura. (See Appendix H.) Establishment of any additional off-campus centers will continue to be subject to Commission review and recommendation under the requirements of Section 66904 of the Education Code.

Within the annual limitations on State supported FTE students specified above, the Trustees should be permitted to determine the mix among external degree programs, Consortium programs, and off-campus, degree-related courses with the understanding that the primary emphasis will be on degree programs; courses that are not part of a degree program to become self-supporting within three years. The Trustees should report to the Governor, the Legislature, and the Postsecondary Education Commission by January 1983 on their progress in directing State support to external degree programs. In addition, beginning in September 1980, the State University should report annually to the Commission and the Legislature, current and projected off-campus FTE students by campus and by category (Consortium, external degree programs, miscellaneous courses, and major centers).

3. Where degree programs at off-campus locations are involved, the segments should endeavor to use regular, full-time faculty to a much greater extent than for individual courses at locations where degree programs are not offered. In this way, it may be possible to achieve a greater consistency in the type and quality of both on- and off-campus degree programs.

4. In conducting external degree programs, all segments should insure that the qualifications of part-time faculty are comparable to those of full-time faculty. They should also endeavor to provide adequate levels of support services, including libraries, counseling, advising, and administration. In addition, all segments should follow closely the tenets of Standard 9 of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for off-campus instruction, especially where degree programs are involved.

5. At present, all proposals for new degree programs to be offered by the University of California and the California State University and Colleges are submitted to the Postsecondary Education Commission for review and comment. These proposals are reviewed to determine their educational merits, the need for trained personnel in the field proposed, and related matters. Where off-campus degree programs are proposed, the review is not generally as detailed as for on-campus programs since all such programs are currently offered on a self-supporting basis. In the future, if off-campus degree programs are funded by the State, as recommended in this report, the Commission should consider not only the educational merits of such programs but also the possibility of duplication of effort with other colleges and universities in the area for which the new program is proposed, including those in the independent segment.

6. All California independent colleges and universities should be requested to advise the Commission concerning their plans for new degree programs which are to be offered at off-campus locations.

   For the Postsecondary Education Commission to consider questions of intersegmental duplication, it will be essential that a complete inventory of external degree programs be maintained on a regular basis. At present, the locations of existing external degree programs are known through the recently completed report, Recent Trends in Off-Campus Education: A Preliminary Analysis of the Fall 1978 Off-Campus Inventory. Each of the public segments currently submits all proposals for new degree programs to the Commission for review and comment; the completeness of the inventory will therefore depend on the extent to which independent colleges and universities are willing to make similar submissions to the Commission.

7. To aid in State decision making, each of the public segments should endeavor to improve its record-keeping efforts, particularly in regard to the maintenance of data on unduplicated headcount in off-campus courses and the cost of off-campus courses and programs.

8. Credit instruction at the lower division level should continue to be exclusive with the California Community Colleges, except in cases where agreements are reached between the Community Colleges and one or both of the public four-year segments.

9. The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges has very recently released a preliminary report, entitled Credit and Noncredit Courses in the California Community Colleges. This report was completed pursuant to a legislative directive in Assembly Bill No. 8 of the 1979 Regular Session of the Legislature. At present, the Chancellor's Office, through a committee appointed to study the subject, is continuing its examination of this issue and will submit a subsequent report in June of 1980. Accordingly, the Governor and the Legislature should delay consideration of any funding changes with regard to credit and noncredit courses until the Chancellor's Office has completed its work and the Commission has had the opportunity to review it, since it deals so extensively with Community College off-campus operations.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Chancellor
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275
(213) 590- 5708

Date: October 15, 1986

To: Presidents

From: William E. Vandament
Provost and Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs

Subject: Expressions of Campus Interest in Assuming Responsibility for Consortium Programs.

The purpose of this memorandum is to seek expressions of campus interest in assuming responsibilities for programs offered currently by The Consortium. For background information, please refer to my memorandum of August 26 on Reorganization of Consortium Programs.

Enclosed are several documents providing information about these programs and academic policy issues that arise in the transfer process:

Attachment A.

- A fact sheet for each of the programs.

Attachment B.

- The advice of The Consortium administration on critical elements of programs designed for adult learners.

Attachment C.

- Draft guidelines under consideration by the Consortium Advisory Committee. These may later be forwarded as recommendations to the Chancellor and me.

In considering the campus interest in these programs, it should be noted that campus external degree programs are eligible for State funding and that such would be treated as enrollments to be added to current projections.

The campus' interest may be expressed for:

- Assuming total responsibility for a program at all of its sites.
- Assuming responsibility for administering a program in its customary regional service area.
- Participating with other campuses in the administration of a program.

A campus may wish to propose an alternative program to meet the needs of students in its service area. However, such proposals must necessarily include provisions to honor commitments to students currently enrolled in such programs.

Although some time may be required to effect the transfer of responsibilities, it is essential that we move as quickly as possible to remove uncertainty for the persons involved in the programs. Therefore, we will explore campus responses as they are received with the objective of developing a plan of action prior to January 1, 1987.

Further information can be obtained from Dr. Ralph Mills, Acting Associate Vice Chancellor, or from Dr. Joan Cobin, Acting Director of The Consortium.

Enclosures

cc: Dr. Ralph Mills
Dr. Joan Cobin

ATTACHMENT A

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACT SHEET

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR, 400 GOLDEN SHORE, LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4275, PUBLIC AFFAIRS, (213) 590-5731

THE CONSORTIUM OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The Consortium of the CSU — "The 1,000-Mile Campus" — was established in 1973 to meet the needs of adult Californians who find it difficult or impossible to take regular on-campus courses. Classes are scheduled at times and locations convenient to students.

Currently, statewide and regional programs are offered in more than 100 areas throughout the state. Over 3,000 students are enrolled.

The Consortium offers:

The rich resources of the country's largest system of senior higher education — 19 campuses with 18,700 faculty and 325,000 students.

Accredited upper division and graduate degree programs — individually tailored to meet the needs of busy, mature Californians.

Individualized courses — to meet the unique requirements of employees in business, industry, government, or education.

Flexible course schedules — with courses offered evenings, weekends, and even through home study, if desired.

Easy enrollment in courses — during first class session (no long lines or other inconveniences).

Credit by assessment — of previously acquired knowledge and competencies.

Senior CSU faculty — chosen for their academic excellence, ability to teach, and demonstrated work experience.

Adjunct faculty — selected for their expertise and leadership in business and industry.

Interlibrary loans — giving students access to more than 10 million books and other publications.

Individualized instruction — where small groups enhance the learning process.

Teaching credential and professional certificate programs — designed to further the careers of individuals and specific groups of employees.

A stimulating learning climate — where highly motivated, experienced adults learn from each other.

No loss of resident credit for mobile students — whose employment requires frequent relocation throughout California.

Continuous educational and career counseling — provided to students during their entire program.

Credit for military and/or work experience — units may be given for military service/courses, instruction in non-collegiate settings, and accredited extension and correspondence courses.

Federally insured loans/grants — to qualified students.

Financial assistance for active military personnel or veterans — to those who qualify.

Constant program evaluation — insuring that all offerings are of the same high quality as those offered on all CSU campuses.

Recognized degrees and certificates — awarded by the Board of Trustees of The California State University.

MORE

San Jose State University (1857) • California State University, Chico (1887) • San Diego State University (1897) • San Francisco State University (1899) • California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (1901) • California State University, Fresno (1911) • Humboldt State University (1913) • California State Polytechnic University, Pomona (1938) • California State University, Los Angeles (1947) • California State University, Sacramento (1947) • California State University, Long Beach (1949) • California State University, Fullerton (1957) • California State University, Hayward (1957) • California State University, Stanislaus (1957) • California State University, Northridge (1958) • Sonoma State University (1960) • California State University, San Bernardino (1960) • California State University, Dominguez Hills (1960) • California State College, Bakersfield (1965) • The Consortium of The California State University (1973)

Programs offered are:

- B.A. in Business Administration
- Master of Business Administration
- B.S. in Health Care Administration
- M.S. in Health Care Administration
- B.S. in Hotel and Restaurant Administration
- B.S. in Nursing
- M.S. in Nursing
- Master of Public Administration
- M.S. in Quality Assurance
- B.S. in Vocational Education
- M.A. in Vocational Education

In addition, The Consortium is approved by the State of California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to recommend teaching credential issuance and to offer course work for completion of the Designated Subjects Credential — in the following areas:

- Adult Education
- Driver Education and Driver Training
- Supervision and Coordination
- Vocational Education

For more information: The Consortium, Office of Admissions and Records, 6300 State University Drive, Long Beach, California 90815-4666, or use toll-free telephone number 800-352-7517.

9/86

CONSORTIUM FACT SHEET

Business Administration

I. PROGRAM INFORMATION

Degress Offered - B.S.B.A., M.B.A.

Current Program Sites - San Luis Obispo/Santa Barbara, Northridge/Cedars - (additional sites under development)

	Actual 1983-84	Actual 1984-85	Actual 1985-86	Projected 1986-87
SCH	N/A	N/A	N/A	900
FTE	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Headcount	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Applicants				100
Graduates				

II. ACADEMIC INFORMATION

Faculty

Program Administration (amount of load)

a. Regional Program Directors 2 .2 overload
0 release time

b. Instructors - Faculty recruitment for late Fall term start-up is currently underway.

c. Mentors/Advisors - N/A

III. PROGRAM OPERATING COST

	1985-86	1986-87
Operating Budget* For All Sites (Including Instruction & Administrative oversight)	N/A	$ 59,054
Academic Oversight (Academic Program Chair)	N/A	3,712

---

*Does not include costs for central support services:

- Central Administration
- Student services (admissions and records, financial aid, enrollment management/data base/student tracking data base.
- Business office/payroll/personnel.
- Marketing - Brochures/Class Schedule/Catalog/Open Houses
- Academic Policy Management and instructional development

CONSORTIUM FACT SHEET

Health Care Administration

I. PROGRAM INFORMATION

Degress Offered - BS & MS

Current Program Sites - Long Beach, Fullerton, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento

	Actual 1983-84	Actual 1984-85	Actual 1985-86	Projected 1986-87
SCH	1,086	1,465	1,493	1,738
FTE	36	49	50	
Headcount	173	228	239	
Applicants	135	142	143	148
Graduates	23	23	33	39

II. ACADEMIC INFORMATION

Faculty

Program Administration (amount of load)

a. Regional Program Directors 3 .2 overload
2 .2 release time

b. Instructors - 41

c. Mentors/Advisors - N/A

III. PROGRAM OPERATING COST

	1985-86	1986-87
Operating Budget* For All Sites (Including Instruction & Administrative oversight)	$138,240	$132,855
Academic Oversight	6,340	4,512

---

*Does not include costs for central support services:

- Central Administration
- Student services (admissions and records, financial aid, enrollment management/data base/student tracking data base.
- Business office/payroll/personnel.
- Marketing - Brochures/Class Schedule/Catalog/Open Houses
- Academic Policy Management and instructional development

CONSORTIUM FACT SHEET

Public Administration

I. PROGRAM INFORMATION

Degress Offered - MPA

Current Program Sites - Pomona, SanJose/Salinas, Northridge/Ventura and Van Nuys

	Actual 1983-84	Actual 1984-85	Actual 1985-86	Projected 1986-87
SCH	834	798	1,132	2,430
FTE	28	27	38	
Headcount	128	129	180	
Applicants	63	75	91	115
Graduates	9	13	34	18

II. ACADEMIC INFORMATION

Faculty

Program Administration (amount of load)

a. Regional Program Directors 6 .2 overload
0 release time

b. Instructors - 21

c. Mentors/Advisors - N/A

III. PROGRAM OPERATING COST

	1985-86	1986-87
Operating Budget* For All Sites (Including Instruction & Administrative oversight)	$ 90,041	$175,619
Academic Oversight	6,225	4,412

---

*Does not include costs for central support services:

- o Central Administration
- o Student services (admissions and records, financial aid, enrollment management/data base/student tracking data base.
- o Business office/payroll/personnel.
- o Marketing - Brochures/Class Schedule/Catalog/Open Houses
- o Academic Policy Management and instructional development

CONSORTIUM FACT SHEET

Quality Assurance

I. PROGRAM INFORMATION

Degress Offered - M.S.

Current Program Sites - Northridge, San Jose (additional sites under development)

	Actual 1983-84	Actual 1984-85	Actual 1985-86	Projected 1986-87
SCH	N/A	N/A	372	900
FTE	N/A	N/A	12	
Headcount			61	70
Applicants				
Graduates			0	0

II. ACADEMIC INFORMATION

Faculty

Program Administration (amount of load)

a. Regional Program Directors 2 .2 overload
0 release time

b. Instructors - 8

c. Mentors/Advisors - N/A

III. PROGRAM OPERATING COST

	1985-86	1986-87
Operating Budget* For All Sites (Including Instruction & Administrative oversight)	$19,579	$64,200
Academic Oversight	2,285	3,712

---

*Does not include costs for central support services:

- Central Administration
- Student services (admissions and records, financial aid, enrollment management/data base/student tracking data base.
- Business office/payroll/personnel.
- Marketing - Brochures/Class Schedule/Catalog/Open Houses
- Academic Policy Management and instructional development

CONSORTIUM FACT SHEET

Nursing

I. PROGRAM INFORMATION

Degress Offered - BS., Nursing

Current Program Sites - Bakersfield, Chico, Dom. Hills, Fresno, Fullerton, Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles Northridge/Ventura, Pomona, Sacramento, San Diego, San Jose, SLO, Sonoma, Stanislaus

	Actual 1983-84	Actual 1984-85	Actual 1985-86	Projected 1986-87
SCH	13,070	16,213	19,621	23,741
FTE	436	540	654	
Headcount	1,761	2,685	2,900	
Applicants	929	1,020	1,019	1,075
Graduates	99	178	219	333

II. ACADEMIC INFORMATION

Faculty

Program Administration (amount of load)

a. Regional Program Directors 20 overload .1,7; .2,8; .3,2; .4,2; .6,1
4 release time .2,3; .6,1

b. Instructors - 167

c. Mentors/Advisors - 234

III. PROGRAM OPERATING COST

	1985-86	1986-87
Operating Budget* For All Sites (Including Instruction & Administrative oversight)	$1,143,741	$1,259,424
Academic Oversight (Central SNP Administration)	234,904	364,162

- -

*Does not include costs for central support services:

- o Central Administration
- o Student services (admissions and records, financial aid, enrollment management/data base/student tracking data base.
- o Business office/payroll/personnel.
- o Marketing - Brochures/Class Schedule/Catalog/Open Houses
- o Academic Policy Management and instructional development

CONSORTIUM FACT SHEET

Nursing

I. PROGRAM INFORMATION

Degress Offered - M.S., Nursing

Current Program Sites - Dom. Hills, Northridge/Ventura, Pomona, San Luis Obispo, San Bernardino

	Actual 1983-84	Actual 1984-85	Actual 1985-86	Projected 1986-87
SCH		169	1,164	3,409
FTE		6	39	
Headcount		67	338	
Applicants		96	206	300
Graduates		0	0	3

II. ACADEMIC INFORMATION

Faculty

Program Administration (amount of load)

a. Regional Program Directors 1 .2 overload
0 release time

b. Instructors - 22

c. Mentors/Advisors - 29

III. PROGRAM OPERATING COST

Operating Budget* For All Sites (Including Instruction & Administrative oversight)	1985-86	1986-87
	$85,377	$169,846
Academic Oversight	(INCLUDED IN BSN)	

---

*Does not include costs for central support services:

- o Central Administration
- o Student services (admissions and records, financial aid, enrollment management/data base/student tracking data base.
- o Business office/payroll/personnel.
- o Marketing - Brochures/Class Schedule/Catalog/Open Houses
- o Academic Policy Management and instructional development

CONSORTIUM FACT SHEET

Vocational & Technological Subjects

I. PROGRAM INFORMATION

Degress Offered - B.S. & M.A.

Current Program Sites - Sacramento, Stanislaus/Modesto/Stockton

	Actual 1983-84	Actual 1984-85	Actual 1985-86	Projected 1986-87
SCH	1,002	779	456	300
FTE	33	26	15	
Headcount	123	117	64	
Applicants	55	66	53	0
Graduates	26	13	20	10

II. ACADEMIC INFORMATION

Faculty

Program Administration (amount of load)

a. Regional Program Directors 1 .2 overload
0 release time

b. Instructors - 21

c. Mentors/Advisors - N/A

III. PROGRAM OPERATING COST

	1985-86	1986-87
Operating Budget* For All Sites (Including Instruction & Administrative oversight)	36,441	$ 25,820
Academic Oversight (Academic Program Faculty)	N/A	0

---

*Does not include costs for central support services:

- o Central Administration
- o Student services (admissions and records, financial aid, enrollment management/data base/student tracking data base.
- o Business office/payroll/personnel.
- o Marketing - Brochures/Class Schedule/Catalog/Open Houses
- o Academic Policy Management and instructional development

ATTACHMENT B
October 15, 1986

Elements Critical to Administering a California State University Systemwide Adult Learner External Degree Program

The definition of adult learner that has been accepted by The California State University Consortium and used as a guide for program development and implementation is one that incorporates the common elements identified by researchers in the area of adult learning. In the context of the CSU Consortium mission statement, the adult learner is one of a population of learners who require a higher education degree yet, for reasons of learning preference, employment or life style, cannot or chooses not to attend a traditional campus programs. Typically, these populations of adult learners fall into two categories: those whose previous education or training no longer leads to satisfying employment, and those who find that the educational requirements for advancement in their chosen occupation have changed. In the first case the previously educated person is seeking preparation in a new discipline. In the second, the preferred degree program is one that builds on previously acquired knowledge and skills and allows for opportunities to earn credit for learning acquired outside the university. The degree programs sought by these learners are usually professionally oriented and often interdisciplinary in nature.

The adult learner is usually characterized as having the following qualities:

- they are goal directed
- they are proven learners with a well-developed learning style
- they are highly motivated
- they bring experience and knowledge to the learning situation

The following critical elements have been identified as integral to CSU Consortium policies and procedures for systemwide external degree programs for the adult learner. We propose that they should be adopted by potential CSU host campuses prior to being approved to offer any existing or future systemwide adult learner oriented external degree program.

Critical Element	Rationale
1. A cadre of committed faculty, appropriate to the degree program, which can be agumented by a pool of qualified practicing professionals.	1. The special learning needs of the nontraditional student requires faculty who are willing to explore innovative instructional planning and delivery methods and can work in a collegial manner with practitioners.

2. Maintain a collaborative relationship with a discipline specific systemwide curriculum committee.	2. A broadly based curriculum development and monitoring committee provides a varied perspective and maximum quality control for program delivery at more than one site.
3. Incorporate nontraditional instructional design and delivery methods into program planning and implementation.	3. The Adult Learner Education Model (ALEM) as developed by the CSU Consortium is based on the assumption that the most effective instructional delivery mode is one which attends to the unique characteristics of the student population.
4. Flexible Academic Calendar.	4. Employed professionals whose families and occupation place constraints on their time require academic scheduling that includes options for short-term courses offered frequently as well as, when appropriate, extended time periods to complete course requirements.
5. Liberal acceptance of credit earned by assessment of prior learning (more than is typically accepted at CSU campuses).	5. Adult student populations employed in professionally oriented occupations have many opportunites to learn specified competencies. This kind of learning occurs through independent reading, professional seminars and non-credit courses. The goal directed learner, given appropriate study guides, is often able to integrate knowledge gained from a variety of experiences to demonstrate required competence for an entire course.

6. Collaborate with community college faculties in occupational programs to facilitate articulation by approving qualified occupational courses for transfer credit.	6. California Community Colleges have historically provided excellent occupational preparation, perhaps to the detriment of students capable of advanced university work. Allowing transfer credit for certain courses will facilitate the educational and career mobility of motivated learners. Therefore, this enriches the workforce and the lives of the individuals.
7. Expanded Student Services (beyond those required for campus based students).	7. The previously described adult learner, while making little use of traditional campus based programs, requires a well planned individualized student services program. It should include uniquely structured advisement procedures, communication strategies, specially prepared A & R transcript evaluators and a well designed computerized student information and tracking system.
8. Specially designed support services for Academic Program Faculty that includes: o Regularly scheduled meetings for communication and planning o Appropriate appointment and compensation strategies o Faculty development that includes facilitating nontraditional instructional design and delivery methods.	8. A WASC Substantive Change report will be required once a campus accepts program responsibility. Standards related to institutional organization, faculty role, and quality of academic programs as they apply to external degree programs mandate policies and procedures related to this critical element.

CAL POLY
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA 93407

October 7, 1986

Dr. William E. Vandament
Provost and Vice Chancellor
Academic Affairs
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802-4275

Dear Vice Chancellor Vandament:

At your request, I am enclosing a draft of the transition period guidelines that the Consortium Advisory Committee intends to recommend for Academic Senate endorsement at the November meeting. Although some minor modifications may occur, I anticipate no changes of substance to these proposals.

Thank you, again, for meeting with our committee last week.

Sincerely,

Joe N. Weatherby, Chair
Consortium Advisory Committee

Enclosure

VICE CHANCELLOR
OCT 21 1986
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT C

Guidelines for the Divestment of Consortium Programs

Whereas, the California State University Academic Senate has authorized the Consortium Advisory Committee to aid in the transfer of Consortium programs to the campuses and,

Whereas, the Consortium Advisory Committee has prepared a list of guidelines for use during this transfer period, therefore be it

Resolved, that the Academic Senate of the California State University endorse and forward these recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT C

Recommended Guidelines for the Transfer of Consortium Programs to the Campuses

Before any Consortium program is transferred to the campuses, the administration of the California State University:

Should consider the recommendations of the relevant Consortium program committee.

Should secure a serious commitment from the receiving campus to serve the unique academic needs of non-traditional students.

Should, when necessary, secure a commitment from the receiving campus to expand student services to meet the unique non-academic needs of non-traditional students.

Should, whenever possible, secure program "mainstream" status rather than continuing education status from the receiving campus.

Shall secure a recognition for the value of relocating a program from the receiving campuses most closely related academic discipline.

Shall obtain acceptance for the program by the academic senate of the receiving campus.

Shall secure an agreement from the receiving campus to honor previous commitments made to the affected former Consortium students so long as they remain in good standing and continuously enrolled.

Shall reaffirm the commitment made, that the California State University intends to consider the credit generated from transferred Consortium programs as budget additions.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of January 1988, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach, *Chairperson*
Henry Der, San Francisco
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles, *Vice Chairperson*
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto
Thomas E. Stang, Los Angeles
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; appointed by the Regents of the University of California

Claudia H. Hampton, Los Angeles; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University

Borgny Baird, Long Beach; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Kenneth L. Peters, Tarzana; appointed by the California State Board of Education

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by California's independent colleges and universities

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other state agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning,

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, William H. Pickens, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514; telephone (916) 445-7933.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON "THE CONSORTIUM OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY: A REPORT"

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 87-45

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

87-33 Information Manual: A Guide to the Commission, Its Policies, Procedures, and Members (September 1987)

87-35 Appropriations in the 1987-88 State Budget for the Public Segments of Higher Education: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (September 1987)

87-36 Supplemental Report on Academic Salaries, 1986-87: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) and Subsequent Postsecondary Salary Legislation (September 1987)

87-37 Improving Student Performance Reporting, Review and Epilogue: The Final Report of the Commission's Project on Transforming Student Academic Performance Data into Useful Information (September 1987)

87-38 California College-Going Rates, 1986 Update: The Tenth in a Series of Reports on New Freshmen Enrollment at California's Colleges and Universities by Recent Graduates of California High Schools (September 1987)

87-39 The Infrastructure Needs of California Public Higher Education Through the Year 2000: A Presentation by William H. Pickens to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, October 14, 1987 (October 1987)

87-40 Final Approval of San Diego State University's Proposal to Construct a North County Center: A Report to the Governor and Legislature Supplementing the Commission's February 1987 Conditional Approval of the Center (November 1987)

87-41 Strengthening Transfer and Articulation Policies and Practices in California's Colleges and Universities: Progress Since 1985 and Suggestions for the Future (November 1987)

87-42 Faculty Development from a State Perspective: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission in Response to Supplementary Language in the 1986 Budget Act (November 1987)

87-43 Evaluation of the California Student Opportunity and Access Program (Cal-SOAP): A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Bill 800 (Chapter 1199, Statutes of 1983) (December 1987)

87-44 The State's Role in Promoting Quality in Private Postsecondary Education: A Staff Prospectus for the Commission's Review of the Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977, as Amended (December 1987)

87-45 Comments and Recommendations on *The Consortium of the California State University: A Report:* A Response to Supplemental Language in the 1987 Budget Act Regarding the Closure of the Consortium (December 1987)

87-46 Developments in Community College Finance: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (December 1987)

87-47 Proposed Construction of the Permanent Off-Campus Center of California State University, Hayward, in Concord: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to a Request for Capital Funds from the California State University for a Permanent Off-Campus Center in Contra Costa County (December 1987)

87-48 Articulating Career Education Programs from High School Through Community College to the Baccalaureate Degree: A Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Educational Community in Response to Assembly Bill 3639 (Chapter 1138, Statutes of 1986) (December 1987)

87-49 Education Offered via Telecommunications: Trends, Issues, and State-Level Problems in Instructional Technology for Colleges and Universities (December 1987)

87-50 California Postsecondary Education Commission News, Number 3 [The third issue of the Commission's periodic newsletter] (December 1987)

Comments and Recommendations on "The Consortium of the California State University: A Report"   Report 87-45